arXiv:0904.0428v1 [math.AP] 2 Apr 2009

Existence results for parabolic problems related to fully non linear operators degenerate or singular

F. Demengel
University of Cergy-Pontoise, site de saint martin, 95302, Cergy-Pontoise
email : demengel@math.u-cergy.fr
fax number : (33) 134256546

Abstract

In this paper we prove some existence and regularity results concerning parabolic equations

$$u_t = F(\nabla u, D^2 u) + f(x,u)$$

with some boundary conditions , on $\Omega\times]0,T[$, where Ω is some bounded domain which possesses the cone property and F is singular or degenerate, with some uniform ellipticity conditions.

Keywords Viscosity solutions, evolution equations, comparison principle.

1 Introduction and hypothesis

In this paper we consider the parabolic equation

$$u_t = F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) + h(x,t)\cdot\nabla u|\nabla u|^\alpha + f(x,t)$$

on some bounded domain $Q_T = \Omega\times]0,T[$ of $\mathbb{R}^N$, with some non zero boundary conditions on the parabolic boundary.

Here the operator is fully non linear and degenerate or singular, it satisfies some assumptions as in [2], which will be detailed later. In particular the class of operators considered contains both the p-Laplace and the Pucci operators, as well as non variational extensions of the p-Laplacian. Both h and f are bounded and continuous functions. The boundary condition will be supposed to be Hölder continuous.

In previous papers [2, 3, 6],the author, in collaboration with Birindelli, has considered the stationary case, introducing the notion of principal eigenvalue and proving the existence of solutions for a large class of Dirichlet problems. The parabolic case treated here requires the introduction of many new tools and new ideas.

We begin by stating a definition of viscosity solutions adapted to the context, the difficulty being that due to the fact that the operator F is not defined when the gradient is zero, one cannot test points on which every test function have the gradient equal to zero. In the stationary case this is solved by just "not testing" such points unless the solution is locally constant. Here the situation is more involved and requires some "testing".

The key points to prove the existence of solution are on one hand, some comparison principle and on the second hand the existence of some upper and lower barriers.

The comparison principle presents some difficulty linked to the non definition of the operators when the gradient of test functions is zero, difficulty overcome with the aid of the adapted definition of viscosity solutions that we propose. This comparison theorem permits in particular to get the uniqueness of solution.

The existence of lower and upper barriers is complicated by the fact that the operator is homogeneous with different powers with respect to t and x, a difference with most of the papers cited before.

In a third time, we use Perron's method adapted to the context.

We also establish some regularity result, more precisely the solutions are Hölder in both the spatial and the time variable, with some exponent which depends on the regularity of the data f and of the boundary value ψ, and also on the parameters of the exterior cone related to the open set Ω.

Finally we also consider to the case of some infinite domain such as $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathbb{R}^N \times]0, T[$.

Analogous problems are studied by Crandall, Kocan, Lions , and Swiech in [8] for the case of Pucci's operators, by Ishii and Souganidis [15] for operators singular or degenerate and homogeneous of degree 1, and by Onhuma and Sato [18] in the case of the p-Laplacian.

In [17] and [12] , Juutinen and Kawhol treat the case of the infinite Laplacian when the right hand side f is zero and the open domain is regular. Let us note that this situation is analogous to the present one when $\alpha = 0$. In their situation the operator is linear with respect to D^2u but it is not well defined on points where the gradient is zero. This leads the authors to give a convenient definition of viscosity solutions. This definition provides a comparison principle and in particular the solutions obtained are unique . The existence is obtained through a regularizing process, and using classical results of Ladishenskaia Uralceva for parabolic problems.

On the other hand [8] the authors consider the case of Pucci's operators in domains which have the uniform exterior cone condition, and with a right hand side f bounded. They exhibit a supersolution and a sub-solution constructed with the aid of the parameters of the cone relative to Ω. They also prove a comparison principle which enables them to prove that the sub-solution is less than the supersolution. Finally through the Perron's method they prove the existence of a solution.

In [18] the authors consider the case of the p-Laplacian and a right hand side zero. They give a convenient definition of viscosity solution which provides a comparison principle . This definition of viscosity solutions requires to introduce a set of admissible test functions when the gradient of u is zero. Since it can be extended to our situation, it is natural to check that it is equivalent to our definition, which is done in the appendix.

2 Notations and hypothesis

In all that paper, (except in section 6) we shall assume that Ω is some bounded domain which satisfies the uniform exterior cone condition, .e. we assume that there exist $\phi \in]0,\pi[$ and $\bar{r} > 0$ such that for any $z \in \partial\Omega$ and for an axe through z of direction $\vec{n}_z$,

$$T_\phi = \{x : \frac{(x-z)\cdot\vec{n}_z}{|z-x|} \leq \cos\phi\}, \qquad T_\phi \cap \overline{\Omega} \cap B_{\bar{r}}(z) = \{z\}.$$

For a real T positive let $Q_T = \Omega \times]0,T[$. We shall denote by ∂Q_T the parabolic boundary $(\partial\Omega \times]0,T[) \cup (\Omega \times \{0\})$. Concerning F we shall assume that $\alpha > -1$ and F satisfies

(H1) $F : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\} \times S \to \mathbb{R}$, is continuous with respect to all its variables, and $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}^\star$, $\mu \geq 0$, for all $x \in \Omega$, $p \neq 0$ and $X \in S$,

$$F(x, tp, \mu X) = |t|^\alpha \mu F(x, p, X).$$

(H2) For $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^N \backslash \{0\}$, $M \in S$, $N \in S$, $N \geq 0$

$$a|p|^\alpha tr(N) \leq F(x, p, M + N) - F(x, p, M) \leq A|p|^\alpha tr(N). \tag{2.1}$$

(H3) There exists a continuous function ω with $\omega(0) = 0$, such that if $(X, Y) \in S^2$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfy

$$-\zeta \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix} \leq 4\zeta \begin{pmatrix} I & -I \\ -I & I \end{pmatrix}$$

and I is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^N$, then for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $x \neq y$

$$F(x, \zeta(x - y), X) - F(y, \zeta(x - y), -Y) \leq \omega(\zeta|x - y|^2).$$

Sometimes this condition $(H3)$ can be replaced by the weaker assumption, which will for example be employed to prove Holder's regularity results :

(H4) There exists a continuous function $\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\omega}(0) = 0$ such that for all x, y, in Ω, $p \neq 0$, $\forall X \in S$

$$|F(x, p, X) - F(y, p, X)| \leq \tilde{\omega}(|x - y|)|p|^\alpha |X|.$$

We assume that h is continuous and bounded on Q_T with values in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and satisfies (H5) :

There exists $\omega_h \leq 1$ and $c_h > 0$ such that for all (x, t), (x, s) in Q_T

$$|h(x, t) - h(x, s)| \leq c_h |t - s|^{\omega_h}.$$

Furthermore

- Either $\alpha \leq 0$ and for all (x, y) in Ω and $t \in]0, T[$

$$|h(x, t) - h(y, t)| \leq c_h |x - y|^{1+\alpha}$$

- or $\alpha > 0$ and for all (x, y) in Ω and $t \in]0, T[$
$(h(x, t) - h(y, t) \cdot x - y) \leq 0.$

Concerning f we shall assume that it is at least continuous and will precise further regularity when it will be needed.

We now give the definition of viscosity solutions adapted to our context.

It is well known that when dealing with viscosity respectively sub and super solutions one works with

$$u^\star(x,t) = \limsup_{(y,\tau),|(y,\tau)-(x,t)|\leq r} u(y,\tau)$$

and

$$u_\star(x,t) = \liminf_{(y,\tau),|(y,\tau)-(x,t)|<r} u(y,\tau).$$

It is easy to see that $u_\star \leq u \leq u^\star$ and $u^\star$ is upper semicontinuous (USC), $u_\star$ is lower semicontinuous (LSC). See e.g. [7, 13].

Definition 1 *We shall say that u, locally bounded, is a viscosity subsolution of*

$$u_t - F(x,\nabla u, D^2u) - h(x,t)\cdot \nabla u|\nabla u|^\alpha \leq f(x,t) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega\times(0,T)$$

if , for any $(\bar x,\bar t)\in\Omega\times(0,T)$,

- *either for all* $\varphi\in\mathcal{C}^2$ *touching* $u^\star$ *by above at* $\bar x$ *such that* $\nabla_x\varphi(\bar x,\bar t)\neq 0$

$$\varphi_t(\bar x,\bar t) - F(\bar x,\nabla\varphi(\bar x,\bar t), D^2\varphi(\bar x,\bar t)) - h(\bar x,\bar t)\cdot\nabla\varphi|\nabla\varphi|^\alpha(\bar x,\bar t) \leq f(\bar x,\bar t).$$

- *or, if there exists* δ_1 *and* $\varphi\in\mathcal{C}^2(]\bar t-\delta_1,\bar t+\delta_1[)$, *such that for any* $t\in\,]\bar t-\delta_1,\bar t+\delta_1[$

$$\begin{cases} \varphi(\bar t) = 0 \\ u^\star(\bar x,\bar t) \geq u^\star(\bar x,t) - \varphi(t) \\ \sup\limits_{t\in]\bar t-\delta_1,\bar t+\delta_1[} (u^\star(x,t)-\varphi(t)) \ \textit{is constant in a neighborhood of } \bar x, \end{cases}$$

then

$$\varphi'(\bar t) \leq f(\bar x,\bar t).$$

u, locally bounded, is a viscosity supersolution of

$$u_t - F(x,\nabla u, D^2u) - h(x,t)\cdot\nabla u|\nabla u|^\alpha \geq f \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega\times(0,T)$$

if , for any $(\bar x,\bar t)\in\Omega\times(0,T)$,

- *either for all* $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^2$ *which touches* $u_\star$ *by below at* $\bar{x}$*, such that* $\nabla_x \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) \neq 0$*,*

  $$\varphi_t(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) - F(\bar{x}, \nabla\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{t}), D^2\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{t})) - h(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) \cdot \nabla\varphi |\nabla\varphi|^\alpha(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) \geq f(\bar{x}, \bar{t}).$$

- *or, if there exists* δ_1 *and* $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^2(]\bar{t} - \delta_1, \bar{t} + \delta_1[)$ *such that for any* $t \in]\bar{t} - \delta_1, \bar{t} + \delta_1[$

  $$\begin{cases} \varphi(\bar{t}) = 0 \\ u_\star(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) \leq u_\star(\bar{x}, t) - \varphi(t) \\ \inf\limits_{t \in]\bar{t} - \delta_1, \bar{t} + \delta_1[} (u_\star(x, t) - \varphi(t)) \text{ is locally constant in a neighborhood of } \bar{x}, \end{cases}$$

  then

  $$\varphi'(\bar{t}) \leq f(\bar{x}, \bar{t}).$$

Finally a continuous function u is a viscosity solution when u is both a viscosity sub and supersolution.

Remark 1 *In the following and for convenience of the reader we recall the definition of semi-jets for parabolic problems :*

$$J^{2,+}u(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) = \{(q, p, X) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times S,\ q(t - \bar{t}) + p.(x - \bar{x}) + \frac{1}{2}{}^t(x - \bar{x}) X (x - \bar{x}) \geq u(x, t) - u(\bar{x}, \bar{t})\}$$

and

$$J^{2,-}u(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) = \{(q, p, X) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times S,\ q(t - \bar{t}) + p.(x - \bar{x}) + \frac{1}{2}{}^t(x - \bar{x}) X (x - \bar{x}) \leq u(x, t) - u(\bar{x}, \bar{t})\}$$

Remark 2 *We prove in the appendix that our solutions are the same as those of Onhuma and Sato in the case where* $\alpha \neq 0$*, and to those of Evans and Spruck and Juutinen and Kawohl in the case of the infinity Laplacian.*

In the following we shall denote by $1_{\{f\}}$ the equation

$$u_t = F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) + h(x, t) \cdot \nabla u |\nabla u|^\alpha + f(x, t)$$

and by $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$ the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t = F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) + h(x, t) \cdot \nabla u |\nabla u|^\alpha + f(x, t) & \text{in } Q_T \\ u(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{on } \partial Q_T \end{cases}$$

Remark 3 *Let us note that if u is a sub-solution (respectively supersolution) of* 1_f *and if* φ *is some* $\mathcal{C}^1$ *function depending only on t,* $(x, t) \mapsto u(x, t) + \varphi(t)$ *is a sub-solution (respectively supersolution) of* $1_{\{f + \varphi'\}}$.

3 Comparison principle and barriers.

We begin to prove a comparison principle for the operator $u_t - F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) - h(x) \cdot \nabla u |\nabla u|^\alpha$. One of its consequences is the uniqueness of the solutions for $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$.

Theorem 1 *Suppose that u is a sub-solution bounded for $1_{\{g\}}$ and v is a super solution bounded of $1_{\{f\}}$ with $g \leq f$ in $\Omega \times]0, T[$, g being upper semicontinuous and f being lower semicontinuous. Suppose that $u^\star \leq v_\star$ on $(\partial\Omega \times [0, T)) \cup (\Omega \times \{0\})$, then $u^\star \leq v_\star$ in $\Omega \times [0, T)$.*

The proof of this theorem requires the following technical lemma which proof is postponed after the proof of theorem 1 for the sake of clearness.

Lemma 1 *Suppose that Ω is some open set. Suppose that u is a supersolution of*

$$u_t - F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) - h(x, t) \cdot \nabla u |\nabla u|^\alpha \geq f(x, t)$$

in $Q_T = \Omega \times]0, T[$ and suppose that C_1 is some constant , that φ is some $\mathcal{C}^2$ function on $]0, T[$, that $k > \sup(2, \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1})$ and $(0, \bar{t}) \in \Omega \times]0, T[$ are such that for some $\delta_1 > 0$

$$\inf_{x \in B(0,\delta_1), |t - \bar{t}| < \delta_1} (u(x, t) - \varphi(t) + C_1 |x|^k) = u(0, \bar{t})$$

Then

$$\varphi'(\bar{t}) \geq f(0, \bar{t}).$$

Proof of theorem 1 :

Suppose by contradiction that $u(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) > v(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$ for some $(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) \in Q_T$, let $\kappa > 0$ be such that

$$\frac{2\kappa}{T - \bar{t}} < \frac{(u - v)(\bar{x}, \bar{t})}{2},$$

then $u_1(x, t) = u(x, t) - \frac{\kappa}{T - t}$ is a strict sub-solution, $v_1(x, t) = v(x, t) + \frac{\kappa}{T - t}$ is a strict supersolution and $u_1 - v_1 > 0$ somewhere in Q_T. Moreover the maximum of $u_1 - v_1$ cannot be achieved in $|t - T| < \frac{T - \bar{t}}{2}$, since in that set one has

$$u - \frac{K}{T - t} - (v + \frac{K}{T - t}) \leq \sup(u - v) - \frac{4\kappa}{T - \bar{t}}$$

while
$$u(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) - \frac{K}{T - \bar{t}} - (v(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) + \frac{K}{T - \bar{t}}) \geq \sup(u - v) - \frac{2\kappa}{T - \bar{t}}.$$
In the following we replace u by $u - \frac{\kappa}{T-t}$ which is a sub-solution of $1_{f - \frac{\kappa}{(T-t)^2}}$ and v by $v + \frac{\kappa}{T-t}$ which a supersolution of $1_{f + \frac{\kappa}{(T-t)^2}}$.

We define for $j \in \mathbf{N}$ and for $k > \sup(2, \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1}, \frac{2(1+\alpha)}{\omega_h})$,

$$\Psi_j(x, t, y, s) = u^\star(x, t) - v_\star(y, s) - \frac{j}{2}|t - s|^2 - \frac{j}{k}|x - y|^k$$

Then ψ_j achieves its maximum on $(x_j, t_j, y_j, s_j) \in (\Omega \times]0, T[)^2$. It is classical that the sequences (x_j, t_j) (y_j, s_j) both converge to $(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$ which is a maximum point for $u^\star - v_\star$, and that $j|s_j - t_j|^2 + j|x_j - y_j|^k \to 0$.

We want to prove that for j large enough $x_j \neq y_j$. Suppose not i.e. $x_j = y_j$ then
$$(y, s) \mapsto v_\star(x_j, s_j) - \frac{j}{k}|x_j - y|^k - \frac{j}{2}|s - t_j|^2 + \frac{j}{2}|t_j - s_j|^2$$
would be a test function from below for $v_\star$ at (x_j, s_j). Then applying Lemma 1 in its form for super-solutions with $C_1 = \frac{j}{k}$, φ replaced by $t \mapsto v_\star(x_j, s_j) - \frac{j}{2}|t - t_j|^2 + \frac{j}{2}|t_j - s_j|^2$, replacing 0 by x_j, and $\bar{t}$ by s_j one would get that

$$-j(s_j - t_j) \geq \frac{\kappa}{T^2} + f(x_j, s_j).$$

On the other hand

$$(x, t) \mapsto u^\star(x_j, t_j) + \frac{j}{k}|x_j - x|^k + \frac{j}{2}|t - s_j|^2 - \frac{j}{2}|t_j - s_j|^2$$

would be a test function from above for $u^\star$ on (x_j, t_j). Using Lemma 1 in its form for sub-solutions, with φ replaced by $t \mapsto u(x_j, t_j) + \frac{j}{2}|t - t_j|^2 - \frac{j}{2}|t_j - s_j|^2$ 0 by x_j, C_1 by $-\frac{j}{k}$, one gets that

$$j(t_j - s_j) \leq g(x_j, t_j) - \frac{\kappa}{T^2}.$$

Substracting the two inequalities, passing to the limit and using the upper semicontinuity of g and the lower semicontinuity of f, one gets that

$$\lim_{j \to +\infty} j(t_j - s_j) + j(s_j - t_j) \leq -\frac{2\kappa}{T^2} + \limsup_{j \to +\infty}(g(x_j, t_j) - f(x_j, s_j)) \leq -\frac{2\kappa}{T^2}$$

which is a contradiction.

We have then proved that $x_j \neq y_j$.

By Ishii's lemma, (see also lemma 2.1 in [2]) there exist $(X_j, Y_j) \in S^2$, with

$$(j(t_j - s_j), j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j), X_j) \in J^{2,+}u^\star(x_j, t_j)$$

$$(j(t_j - s_j), j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j), -Y_j) \in J^{2,-}v_\star(y_j, s_j)$$

and for some positive constant c

$$\begin{pmatrix} X_j & 0 \\ 0 & Y_j \end{pmatrix} \leq cj|x_j - y_j|^{k-2} \begin{pmatrix} I & -I \\ -I & I \end{pmatrix}$$

This implies that, using assumption (H3) and the fact that $j|x_j - y_j|^k \to 0$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dfrac{\kappa}{T^2} + f(y_j, s_j) & \leq & j(t_j - s_j) - F(y_j, j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j), -Y_j) \\ & + & j^{1+\alpha}h(y_j, s_j) \cdot (x_j - y_j)|x_j - y_j|^{k-2+(k-1)\alpha} \\ & \leq & j(t_j - s_j) - F(x_j, j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j), X_j) + o(1) \\ & + & j^{1+\alpha}h(x_j, t_j) \cdot (x_j - y_j)|x_j - y_j|^{k-2+(k-1)\alpha} + o(1) \\ & \leq & g(x_j, t_j) - \dfrac{\kappa}{T^2} + o(1), \end{array}$$

Using the lower semicontinuity of f, the uppersemicontinuity of g and letting $j \to +\infty$ we get a contradition.

In the previous inequalities we have used

$$\begin{array}{rcl} |h(x_j, t_j) - h(x_j, s_j)| & & |x_j - y_j|^{(k-1)(1+\alpha)} j^{1+\alpha} \\ & \leq & c_h|t_j - s_j|^{\omega_h} j^{1+\alpha}|x_j - y_j|^{(k-1)(1+\alpha)} \\ & \leq & (j|t_j - s_j|^2)^{\frac{\omega_h}{2}} (j|x_j - y_j|^k)^{\frac{(1+\alpha)(k-1)}{k}} j^{\frac{1+\alpha}{k} - \frac{\omega_h}{2}} \\ & = & o(1) \end{array}$$

and when $\alpha < 0$

$$|h(x_j, s_j) - h(y_j, s_j)||x_j - y_j|^{(k-1)(1+\alpha)} j^{1+\alpha} \leq j^{1+\alpha}|x_j - y_j|^{k(1+\alpha)} = o(1).$$

Proof of Lemma 1 First replacing if necessary φ by $\varphi(t) + C_2|t - \bar{t}|^2$ for some constant $C_2 > 0$ and C_1 by some constant $> C_1$ one can assume that the infimum is strict in x and t separately.

Clearly $\psi(x,t)=\varphi(t)-C_1|x|^k-C_2(t-\bar{t})^2$ is a test function for u in $(0,\bar{t})$ but its gradient with respect to x is zero. So we are going to prove that either the function $t\mapsto\varphi(t)+C_2|t-\bar{t}|^2$ is a test function as in the second case of the definition of viscosity supersolution and then the conclusion of the Lemma is immediate. Or, if this is not the case, then it is possible to construct a sequence of points tending to $(0,\bar{t})$ for which there exists a test function which gradient with respect to x is different from zero, but tend to zero. Then passing to the limit we get the required inequality.

Hence we suppose first that the function $t\mapsto\varphi(t)-C_2|t-\bar{t}|^2$ is as in the definition of viscosity supersolution i.e. we suppose that there exists $\delta_1>0$, and $\bar{\delta}>0$ such that for all $x\in B(0,\bar{\delta})$,

$$\inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}\{v(x,t)-\varphi(t)+C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}=\inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}\{v(0,t)-\varphi(t)+C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}.$$

We claim that this infimum is achieved on $(0,\bar{t})$. Indeed, the infimum is less or equal to $v(0,\bar{t})$ and on the other hand it is more than $\inf_{x\in B(0,\delta_1),|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}\{v(x,t)+C_1|x|^k-\varphi(t)+C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}$ which equals $v(0,\bar{t})$.

Then the conclusion given in that case in the definition of viscosity supersolution is that $\varphi'(\bar{t})\le f(0,\bar{t})$.

We now suppose that we are not in this situation i.e. that $x\mapsto\inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}v(x,t)-\varphi(t)+C_2|t-\bar{t}|^2$ is not constant in a neighborhood of $\bar{x}$.

Recall that since the infimum is strict in x and t separately, for all $\delta>0$, $\delta<\delta_1$ there exists $\epsilon(\delta)>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\inf\Bigg(\inf_{|t-\bar{t}|>\delta,x\in B(0,\delta_1)}\{v(x,t)+&\quad C_1|x|^k-\varphi(t)+C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\},\\ &\inf_{|t-\bar{t}|>\delta_1,|x|>\delta}\{v(x,t)+C|x|^k-\varphi(t)+C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}\Bigg)\\ \ge&\quad v(0,\bar{t})+\epsilon(\delta).\end{aligned}$$

We now choose $\delta_2\le\inf(\frac{\epsilon(\delta)}{4C_1k(2\delta_1)^{k-1}},\delta)$. Then, with that choice, for all $x\in B(0,\delta_2)$

$$\inf_{y\in B(0,\delta_1),|t-\bar{t}|\le\delta_1}\{v(y,t)+C_1|x-y|^k-\varphi(t)+C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}\le v(0,\bar{t})+\frac{\epsilon(\delta)}{4}$$

while

$$\inf_{|y|>\delta,|t-\bar{t}|\le\delta_1}\{v(y,t)-\varphi(t)+C_1|y-x|^k-b(t-\bar{t})+C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}\ge v(0,\bar{t})+\frac{3\epsilon(\delta)}{4}.$$

Moreover one also has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{y\in B(0,\delta_1),|t-\bar t|>\delta}\{v(y,t)-\varphi(t)+C|x-y|^k+C_2(t-\bar t)^2\}\\
\geq\ &\inf_{y\in B(0,\delta_1),|t-\bar t|>\delta}\{v(y,t)-\varphi(t)+C_1|y|^k+C_2(t-\bar t)^2\}-\frac{\epsilon(\delta)}{4}\\
\geq\ &v(0,\bar t)+\frac{3\epsilon(\delta)}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that for all $x\in B(0,\delta_2)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{y\in B(0,\delta_1),|t-\bar t|<\delta_1}\{v(y,t)+C_1|y-x|^k-\varphi(t)+C_2(t-\bar t)^2\}\\
&=\inf_{y\in B(0,\delta),|t-\bar t|\leq\delta}\{v(y,t)+C_1|y-x|^k-\varphi(t)+C_2(t-\bar t)^2\}. \qquad (3.2)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $x\mapsto\inf_{|t-\bar t|<\delta_1}\{v(x,t)-\varphi(t)+C_2|t-\bar t|^2\}$ is not constant in a neighborhood of $\bar x$, there exist $(x_\delta,y_\delta)\in B(0,\delta_2)$

$$\inf_{|t-\bar t|<\delta_1}\{v(x_\delta,t)-\varphi(t)+C_2|t-\bar t|^2\}>\inf_{|t-\bar t|<\delta_1}\{v(y_\delta,t)-\varphi(t)+C_1|x_\delta-y_\delta|^k+C_2|t-\bar t|^2\}$$

Hence

$$\inf_{y\in B(0,\delta_1),|t-\bar t|<\delta_1}\{v(y,t)-\varphi(t)+C_1|x_\delta-y|^k+C_2|t-\bar t|^2\}$$

is achieved on some point (z_δ,t_δ) with $z_\delta\neq x_\delta$. Indeed if it was achieved on (x_δ,t_δ) for some t_δ one would have

$$\begin{aligned}
v(x_\delta,t_\delta)-\varphi(t_\delta)\ &+\ C_2|t_\delta-\bar t|^2\\
&=\inf_{y\in B(0,\delta_1),|t-\bar t|<\delta_1}\{v(y,t)-\varphi(t)+C_1|x_\delta-y|^k+C_2|t-\bar t|^2\}\\
&\leq\inf_{|t-\bar t|<\delta_1}\{v(y_\delta,t)-\varphi(t)+C_1|y_\delta-x_\delta|^k+C_2|t-\bar t|^2\}\\
&<\inf_{|t-\bar t|<\delta_1}\{v(x_\delta,t)-\varphi(t)+C_2|t-\bar t|^2\}\\
&\leq v(x_\delta,t_\delta)-\varphi(t_\delta)+C_2|t_\delta-\bar t|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Moreover using (3.2), the infimum is achieved in $B(0,\delta)\times]\bar t-\delta,\bar t+\delta[$.

All this imply that $(y,t) \mapsto v(z_\delta, t_\delta) + \varphi(t) - \varphi(\bar t_\delta) + C_1|x_\delta - z_\delta|^k - C_1|x_\delta - y|^k + C_2(t_\delta - \bar t)^2 - C_2|t-\bar t|^2$ is a test function for v on (z_δ, t_δ) and since v is a supersolution

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi'(t_\delta) - 2C_2(t_\delta - \bar t) &- F(-C_1 k|x_\delta - z_\delta|^{k-2}(z_\delta - x_\delta), X_\delta)\\ &+ k^{1+\alpha}|x_\delta - z_\delta|^{(k-1)(\alpha+1)-1} h(z_\delta, t_\delta)\cdot(z_\delta - x_\delta)\\ &\geq f(z_\delta, t_\delta)\end{aligned}$$

where $X_\delta = -D^2(C_1|x_\delta - y|^k)\mid_{y=z_\delta}$. We have finally obtained that

$$\varphi'(t_\delta) - 2C_2(t_\delta - \bar t) + C_1^{1+\alpha}|x_\delta - z_\delta|^{k(\alpha+1)-\alpha-2} + |h|_\infty k^{1+\alpha}(2\delta)^{(k-1)(\alpha+1)} \geq f(z_\delta, t_\delta).$$

Using $x_\delta \in B(0,\delta_2) \subset B(0,\delta)$, $z_\delta \in B(0,\delta)$ and $k > \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1}$,

$$\varphi'(t_\delta) + o(1) \geq f(z_\delta, t_\delta).$$

Letting δ go to zero, and using the lower semicontinuity of f one gets the result. This ends the proof of lemma 1.

We now construct a supersolution and a subsolution for $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$ We recall that in [6] we constructed a global barrier for the stationary case:

Proposition 1 *For all $z \in \partial\Omega$, there exists some function W_z continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$, such that $W_z(z) = 0$, $W_z > 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \{z\}$, which satisfies*

$$F(x, \nabla W_z, D^2 W_z) + h(x,t)\cdot\nabla W_z|\nabla W_z|^\alpha \leq -1 \quad in \quad \Omega.$$

Furthermore $\nabla W_z \neq 0$ everywhere and there exist $\underline{c} > 0$, $\overline{c} > 0$ and $\gamma \in]0,1[$ which depend on the parameters of the cone, such that for all $z \in \partial\Omega$ and $x \in \Omega$

$$\underline{c}|z-x|^\gamma \leq W_z(x) \leq \overline{c}|x-z|^\gamma.$$

Remark 4 *In fact one can ask, up to change the constants γ and the constants $\underline{c}$ and $\overline{c}$ that W_z be such that $-W_z$ be also a sub-solution of*

$$F(x, \nabla(-W_z), D^2(-W_z)) - h(x,t)\cdot\nabla W_z|\nabla W_z|^\alpha \geq 1 \quad in \quad \Omega.$$

The proof of Proposition 1 can be found in [6].

We now give some existence's result of supersolutions and sub-solutions for the parabolic problem.

Proposition 2 *Suppose that ψ is Lipschitzian in t, Hölderian with exponent γ in x. Suppose that f is uniformly bounded. Then there exists a continuous supersolution W of $1_{\{|f|_\infty,\psi\}}$.*

In the same manner there exists a continuous sub-solution V of $1_{\{-|f|_\infty,\psi\}}$.

Proof of proposition 2.

Let c_ψ be some holder's constant for ψ. We define

$$W_1(x,t) := \inf_{(z,\tau)\in\partial\Omega\times]0,T[} \{\psi(z,\tau)+\left(\frac{c_\psi}{\underline{c}} + (|\psi_t|_\infty + |f|_\infty)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}\right) W_z(x)+|\psi_t|_\infty|t-\tau|\}.$$

Let us note that $\left(\frac{c_\psi}{\underline{c}} + (|\psi_t|_\infty + |f|_\infty)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}\right) W_z(x) + |\psi_t|_\infty|t-\tau|$. is a supersolution of $1_{|f|_\infty}$ since defining $\lambda_2 = \frac{c_\psi}{\underline{c}} + (|\psi_t|_\infty + |f|_\infty)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}$, one has $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 = (|\psi_t|_\infty + |f|_\infty)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} -F(x,\lambda_2\nabla W_z, &\quad \lambda_2 D^2 W_z) - h(x)\cdot\lambda_2\nabla W_z|\lambda_2\nabla W_z|^\alpha \\ &= -\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right)^{1+\alpha}\left(F(x,\lambda_1\nabla W_z,\lambda_1 D^2 W_z) + h(x,t)\cdot\nabla(\lambda_1 W_z)|\nabla(\lambda_1 W_z)|^\alpha\right) \\ &\geq -F(x,\lambda_1 DW_z,\lambda_1 D^2 W_z) - h(x,t)\cdot\nabla(\lambda_1 W_z)|\nabla(\lambda_1 W_z)|^\alpha \\ &\geq |f|_\infty + |\psi_t|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

Moreover in the viscosity sense , $\partial_t(|t-\tau|) \geq -1$. This implies that all the functions in the infimum are supersolutions of $1_{\{|f|_\infty\}}$. Acting as in the proof of proposition 3 in section 4, one can prove that W_1 being the infimum of supersolutions is a supersolution.

We prove that W_1 satisfies the boundary condition on the lateral boundary $W_1(x,t) := \psi(x,t)$ for $x\in\partial\Omega$ and $t\in]0,T[$. Indeed first taking (x,t) in the infimum one gets $W_1(x,t)\leq\psi(x,t)$. On the other hand for all $(z,\tau)\in\partial\Omega\times]0,T[$ $\psi(z,\tau) + \frac{c_\psi}{\underline{c}}\underline{c}|x-z|^\gamma + |\psi_t|_\infty|t-\tau| \geq \psi(x,t)$ which implies by considering the infimum, the reverse inequality.

The same arguments permit to check that $W_1(x,0)\geq\psi(x,0)$ for all $x\in\Omega$.

We now define $q_1 = \sup\{2,\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1}\}$, $q = \frac{q_1}{\gamma}$, $c_q = (q-1)^{q-1} + (q-1)^{\frac{1-q}{q}}$.

and also

$$K_2 = (\text{diam }\Omega|h|_\infty + A(N+q_1-2))(\text{diam }\Omega)^{\sup(\alpha,0)}, \tag{3.3}$$

Then, it is not difficult to see that for any positive constant K_1 and for all y

$$(x,t) \mapsto K_1|x-y|^{q_1} + K_1^{1+\alpha} K_2 t$$

is a supersolution of $1_{\{0\}}$ and then in particular taking $K_1 = \frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}$ with c_q defined above, for all $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $y \in \Omega$

$$(x,t) \mapsto \frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}|x-y|^{q_1} + (|f|_\infty + |\psi_t|_\infty)t + \left(\frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}\right)^{1+\alpha} K_2 t$$

is a supersolution of $1_{\{|f|_\infty\}}$.

Then if we define

$$W_2(x,t) := \inf_{y\in\Omega, \kappa\in\mathbb{R}^+}\{\psi(y,0)+\kappa+\frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}|x-y|^{q_1}+(|f|_\infty+|\psi_t|_\infty)t+\left(\frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}\right)^{1+\alpha} K_2 t\},$$

W_2 being the infimum of supersolutions of $1_{|f|_\infty}$, it is a supersolution of $1_{|f|_\infty}$.

We need to check that $W_2(x,0) = \psi(x)$. On one hand, by taking $y = x$ in the infimum and $t = 0$ one gets $W_2(x,t) \leq \kappa + \psi(x,0)$ for all κ and on the second hand, we use the identity for $q > 1$, and for any positive number P

$$\inf_{\kappa\in\mathbb{R}^+}\{\kappa + \frac{P}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}\} = P^{\frac{1}{q}} \tag{3.4}$$

that we apply here with $P = c_\psi^q |x-y|^{q_1}$. It gives

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(x,0) &= \inf_{y\in\Omega,\kappa\in\mathbb{R}^+}\{\psi(y,0) + \kappa + \frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}|x-y|^{q_1}\} \\ &= \inf_{y\in\Omega}\{\psi(y,0) + c_\psi|x-y|^\gamma\} \\ &\geq \psi(x,0). \end{aligned}$$

We need also to check that $W_2(x,t) \geq \psi(x,t)$ when $x \in \partial\Omega$.

For that aim we use for all $x \in \Omega$

$$W_2(x,t) \geq \inf_{y\in\Omega,\kappa\in\mathbb{R}^+}\{\psi(y,0)+\kappa+\frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}|x-y|^{q_1}\}+|\psi_t|_\infty|t| \geq \psi(x,0)+|\psi_t|_\infty|t| \geq \psi(x,t).$$

Moreover since W_2 is an infimum of continuous function it is upper semicontinuous and then for all $x \in \partial\Omega$ and for all $t \in]0,T[$

$$W_2(x,t) \geq \limsup_{x_n \in \Omega, x_n \to x} W_2(x_n,t) \geq \lim_{x_n \in \Omega, x_n \to x} \psi(x_n,t) = \psi(x,t)$$

We now define

$$W(x,t) = \inf(W_1(x,t), W_2(x,t))$$

Then W is a supersolution of $1_{\{|f|_\infty,\psi\}}$

Similarly one can define a sub-solution :

$$V(x,t) = \sup(V_1(x,t), V_2(x,t))$$

with

$$V_1(x,t) := \sup_{(z,\tau)\in\partial\Omega\times]0,T[,\kappa\in\mathbb{R}^+} \{\psi(z,\tau) - \left(\frac{c_\psi}{\underline{c}} + (|\psi_t|_\infty + |f|_\infty)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}\right) W_z(x) - |\psi_t|_\infty |t-\tau|\}.$$

and

$$V_2(x,t) = \sup_{y\in\Omega,\kappa\in\mathbb{R}^+} \{\psi(y,0) - \kappa - \frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}} |x-y|^{q_1} - (|f|_\infty + |\psi_t|_\infty)t - \left(\frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}\right)^{1+\alpha} K_2 t\}$$

and K_2 has been defined before.Then V is a sub-solution of $1_{\{-|f|_\infty,\psi\}}$. This ends the proof of proposition 2.

Moreover by the comparison principle in theorem 1

$$V \leq W.$$

4 Existence and regularity.

In this section, we first prove, via Perron's method and with the aid of the sub and supersolutions just defined, that there exists u a unique continuous solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_t - F(x,\nabla u, D^2 u) - h(x,t)\cdot\nabla u|\nabla u|^\alpha = f & \text{in } Q_T \\ u = \psi(x,t) & \text{on } \partial Q_T. \end{cases}$$

Next we prove some Hölder's estimates on this solution.

We consider V and W as before, $V \leq W$, and V is a subsolution, W is a supersolution. Let

$$E = \{u, \text{subsolution of } 1_{\{f,\psi\}} \ , \ V \leq u \leq W\}.$$

Using Perron's method adapted to our context we need to prove that for $u =: \sup E$, the lower semi-continuous enveloppe $u_\star$ is a super solution of $(1)_{f,\psi}$, while $u^\star$ is a sub-solution. This can be done using the following proposition :

Proposition 3 *Suppose that Ω is some open set in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Suppose that u_n is some locally uniformly bounded sequence of sub-solutions for*

$$(u_n)_t - F(x, \nabla u_n, D^2 u_n) - h(x) \cdot \nabla u_n |\nabla u_n|^\alpha \leq f.$$

Let $\bar{u}$ be defined as

$$\bar{u}(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) = \limsup_{r \to 0} \{u_n(y, s), n \geq \frac{1}{r}, |t - s| + |y - x| \leq r\}$$

Suppose that f is upper semicontinuous. Then $\bar{u}$ is a sub-solution .

Proof

$\bar{u}$ is upper semicontinuous by construction.

We assume that we are in the "bad " case, ie that $(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$ is such that there exists φ which depends only on t, such that $\varphi(\bar{t}) = 0$, and for some δ_1, $\sup_{t \in B(\bar{t}, \delta_1)} (\bar{u}(x, t) - \varphi(t)) = \bar{u}(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$, with for some δ, $x \mapsto \sup_{t \in B(\bar{t}, \delta_1)} (\bar{u}(x, t) - \varphi(t))$ is constant on $B(\bar{x}, \delta)$. Then $\max_{x \in B(0,\delta), t \in B(\bar{t}, \delta_1)} (\bar{u}(x, t) - \varphi(t)) = \bar{u}(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$.

Let $k > \sup(2, \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1})$.

We also have $\sup_{x \in B(0,\delta), |t - \bar{t}| < \delta_1} \{\bar{u}(x, t) - \varphi(t)) - |x - \bar{x}|^k - |t - \bar{t}|^2\} = \bar{u}(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$ and the supremum is strict in x and t separately.

We now consider

$$\sup_{x \in B(\bar{x}, \delta), |t - \bar{t}| < \delta_1} \{u_n^\star(x, t) - \varphi(t) - |x - \bar{x}|^k - |t - \bar{t}|^2\}$$

This supremum is achieved on some (x_n, t_n). We begin to observe that $u_n^\star(x_n, t_n) \to \bar{u}(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$. Indeed by definition of $\bar{u}$, there exists (y_n, s_n) which goes to $(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$ and $u_n^\star(y_n, s_n) \to \bar{u}(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$. Then $u_n^\star(x_n, t_n) - \varphi(t_n) - |x_n - \bar{x}|^k - |t_n - \bar{t}|^2 \geq u_n^\star(y_n, s_n) - \varphi(t_n) - |y_n - \bar{x}|^k - |s_n - \bar{t}|^2 \to \bar{u}(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$, which implies that $\liminf u_n^\star(x_n, t_n) \geq \bar{u}(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$. On the other hand, using the definition of $\bar{u}$

$$\limsup_n u_n^\star(x_n, t_n) \leq \bar{u}(\bar{x}, \bar{t}).$$

Moreover since the supremum is strict, $(x_n, t_n) \to (\bar{x}, \bar{t})$.

If $\bar{x} \neq x_n$ for an infinity of n, using the fact that $(x,t) \mapsto \varphi(t) + |x-\bar{x}|^k + |t-\bar{t}|^2$ is a test function for $u_n^\star$ on (x_n, t_n) with a non zero gradient with respect to x on (x_n, t_n), one gets that for some constant C

$$\begin{array}{rcl}\varphi'(t_n) + 2(t_n - \bar{t}) & - & Ck^{2+\alpha}|x_n - \bar{x}|^{k(\alpha+1)-\alpha-2} - k^{1+\alpha}|h|_\infty |x_n - \bar{x}|^{(k-1)(\alpha+1)} \\ & \leq & \varphi'(t_n) + 2(t_n - \bar{t}) - F(k|x_n - \bar{x}|^{k-2}(x_n - \bar{x}), D^2(|x-\bar{x}|^k)(x_n)) \\ & - & h(x_n, t_n) \cdot (x_n - \bar{x}) k^{1+\alpha} |x_n - \bar{x}|^{(k-1)(\alpha+1)-1} \\ & \leq & f(x_n, t_n)\end{array}$$

This gives the result by passing to the limit since $k > \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1}$ and f is upper semicontinuous. We now suppose that $x_n = \bar{x}$ for all n large enough. Then using lemma 1 in its form for sub- solutions one gets that

$$\varphi'(t_n) + 2(t_n - \bar{t}) - 0 \leq f(\bar{x}, t_n).$$

Once more by passing to the limit and using the upper semi continuity of f we get the desired result.

When we are not in the "bad case", one can argue as in [13] and [3], Proposition 5.2, so we finally get that $\bar{u}$ is a supersolution.

By the comparison principle Theorem 1, we get that $u_\star \geq u^\star$ hence the function u is continuous and it is the required solution. We also know that it is unique, again by the comparison principle.

We now prove some Hölder's estimate :

Theorem 2 *Let u be the solution of $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$. Suppose that f is continuous, bounded on Q_T, and Hölder's continuous of exponent γ_f with respect to t, that ψ is Hölder's continuous with exponent γ with respect to x and Lipschitzian in t. Then there exists some constant c, such that for all $(x,t),(y,s)$ in Q_T^2, and for $q = \frac{q_1}{\gamma} = \sup\left(\frac{\alpha+2}{\gamma(\alpha+1)}, \frac{2}{\gamma}\right)$ $\gamma^\star = \inf(\gamma_f, \frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha})$*

$$|u(x,t) - u(y,s)| \leq c(|x-y|^\gamma + |t-s|^{\gamma^\star}).$$

Corollary 1 *Suppose that (f_n) is a sequence of uniformly bounded functions, continuous w.r.t. x and uniformly Hölderian in t, and (ψ_n) is uniformly Holder's continuous in x and uniformly Lipshitzian in t, then the sequence (u_n) of solutions of $1_{\{f_n,\psi_n\}}$ is uniformly Holder's continuous and bounded.*

In order to prove Theorem 2 we give two preliminary results, which establish some Hölder's estimates on the bottom and on the lateral boundary of Q_T.

Proposition 4 *Let* $Q_T = \Omega\times]0,T[$.

Let ψ *be an Hölder function with exponent* γ *in* x *and Lipshitzian in* t *on* ∂Q_T*, let* f *be continuous on* $\overline{Q_T}$ *and let* u *be the solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) + h(x,t)\cdot \nabla u |\nabla u|^\alpha + f(x,t) & \text{in } Q_T \\ u(x,t) = \psi(x,t) & \text{on } \ (\partial\Omega\times]0,T[) \ \cup (\Omega\times\{0\}) \end{cases}$$

Then there exists some constant C_2 *such that, for all* $(x,t)\in \Omega\times]0,T[$,

$$|u(x,t) - \psi(x,0)| \leq C_2 t^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}}$$

(We recall that $q = \frac{\sup(2, \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1})}{\gamma}$*).*

Proof.

By the comparison principle in theorem 1 one has

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) &\leq W(x,t) \\ &\leq W_2(x,t) \\ &\leq \psi(x,0) + \inf_{\kappa\in \mathbb{R}^+}\left(\kappa + \left(\frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}\right)^{1+\alpha} K_2 t\right) + (|f|_\infty + |\psi_t|_\infty) t \\ &= \psi(x,0) + C t^{\frac{1}{(q-1)(1+\alpha)+1}} + (|f|_\infty + |\psi_t|_\infty) t \end{aligned}$$

for some constant C which depends on $(c_\psi, A, a, q_1, \gamma)$, computed with the aid of (3.4) replacing q by $(q-1)(\alpha+1)+1$.

This yields the result. The symmetric lower bound is obtained by considering V instead of W and proceeding similarly.

As a consequence one has the following

Proposition 5 *We assume here that* f *is continuous on* $\overline{Q_T}$*, Hölder with respect to* t*, with some exponent* γ_f*. Let* u *be a solution of* $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$*. Then there exists* C_2 *depending on the Hölder's constant* c_ψ *and* c_f *of* ψ *and* f *respectively , such that for all* $x\in\Omega$ *and for all* $(t,s)\in]0,T[^2$,

$$|u(x,t+s) - u(x,t)| \leq C_2 s^{\gamma^\star}.$$

where $\gamma^\star = \inf(\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}, \gamma_f)$*,* $q = \frac{\sup(2,\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1})}{\gamma} = \frac{q_1}{\gamma}$.

Proof of Proposition 5: Let c_f be such that

$$|f(x,t+s)-f(x,t)| \le c_f s^{\gamma_f}.$$

We define for s fixed in]0, T[

$$\begin{aligned} v(x,t) &= u(x,t+s)+t\ c_f s^{\gamma_f} + \sup_{(x,t)\in\partial\Omega\times]0,T-s[} |\psi(x,t+s)+c_f t s^{\gamma_f}-\psi(x,t)| \\ &+ \sup_{x\in\Omega}|u(x,s)-\psi(x,0)| \end{aligned}$$

Then v satisfies on $\Omega\times]0,T-s[$

$$\partial_t v - F(x,\nabla v, D^2 v) - h(x,t)\cdot\nabla v|\nabla v|^\alpha = f(x,t+s)+c_f s^{\gamma_f} \ge f(x,t)$$

Since u satisfies the opposite inequality on the same open set, and by construction $v(x,t)\ge u(x,t)$ on ∂Q_T, one has by theorem 1

$$u(x,t)-v(x,t)\le 0,$$

which gives the result, redefining $C_2 = 2T^{1+\gamma_f-\gamma^\star}+|\psi_t|_\infty T^{1-\gamma^\star}+C_2 T^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}-\gamma^\star}$ For the reverse inequality, one uses fro s fixed

$$\begin{aligned} v(x,t) &= u(x,t+s)-t\ c_f s^{\gamma_f} - \sup_{(x,t)\in\partial\Omega\times]0,T-s[} |\psi(x,t+s)+c_f t s^{\gamma_f}-\psi(x,t)| \\ &- \sup_{x\in\Omega}|u(x,s)-\psi(x,0)| \end{aligned}$$

v is a sub-solution of

$$v_t - F(\nabla v, D^2 v) - h(x,t)\cdot\nabla v|\nabla v|^\alpha \le f(x,t+s)-c_f s^{\gamma_f} \le f(x,t)$$

and $u(x,t)$ satisfies the opposite inequality on $]0,T-s[$. Moreover $v(x,t)\le u(x,t)$ on ∂Q_T. Then Theorem 1 implies that

$$u(x,t+s)\le u(x,t)+C_2 s^{\gamma^\star}$$

with C_2 as above.

We now give an estimate on the lateral boundary :

Proposition 6 *We assume that ψ is Hölder continuous of exponent γ with respect to x and Lipschitzian with respect to t. Let u be a solution of $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$. Then there exists C_1 such that for all $(x,x_o)\in\Omega\times\partial\Omega$ and $t\in[0,T)$,*

$$|u(x,t)-u(x_o,t)|\le C_1|x-x_o|^\gamma.$$

Proof

We use once more the supersolution. Taking in the infimum defining W the point (x_o, t) which is on the lateral boundary, and using the properties of the barrier, one has

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) &\leq W(x,t) \\ &\leq W_1(x,t) \\ &\leq \psi(x_o,t) + \frac{c_\psi}{\underline{c}} W_{x_o}(x) + (|f|_\infty + |\psi_t|_\infty)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} W_{x_o}(x) \\ &\leq \psi(x_o,t) + (\frac{c_\psi}{\underline{c}} + (|f|_\infty + |\psi_t|_\infty)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}})\bar{c}|x-x_o|^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

This gives the result with

$$C_1 = \bar{c}(\frac{c_\psi}{\underline{c}} + (|f|_\infty + |\psi_t|_\infty)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}})$$

One gets the lower bound by considering V instead of W.

We now prove Theorem 2. First observe that u is bounded as soon as f and ψ are bounded, due to theorem 1, the inequalities $V \leq u \leq W$, and the definition of V and W.

In the following δ will be $< \inf(1, \frac{1}{T})$, and $L > 1$.

We construct a function Φ as follows: Let δ be small enough in order that, for $\tilde{\omega}$ the modulus of continuity given in the assumption (H3), and C being the universal constant defined in (4.7) later, one has $\tilde{\omega}(\delta) < \frac{a}{4C}$, and $\delta |h|_\infty < \frac{a}{C}$. We define

$$L = \sup\left(C_1, \left(\frac{|f|_\infty \delta^{\alpha+1-(\alpha+2)\gamma}}{a\,(\gamma)^{1+\alpha}\,(1-\gamma)}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}, \frac{2\sup u}{\delta^\gamma}\right)$$

$$M = \sup(TC_2, \frac{2\sup u}{\delta^{\gamma^\star}})$$

where C_1 is given in Proposition 6, and C_2 is given in Proposition 5. We also define

$$\Delta_\delta = \{((x,t),(y,s)) \in Q_T^2,\ |x-y| < \delta, |t-s| < \delta\}.$$

Claim *For any* $(x,t),(y,s) \in \Delta_\delta$

$$\Phi(x,t,y,s) = u(x,t) - u(y,s) - L|x-y|^\gamma - M|t-s|^{\gamma^\star} \leq 0. \tag{4.5}$$

Suppose for a while that the supremum of ϕ is positive. Then, for κ small enough the supremum of $\phi - \frac{\kappa}{T-t} - \frac{\kappa}{T-s}$ is also strictly positive. In the following we replace ϕ by $\phi - \frac{\kappa}{T-t} - \frac{\kappa}{T-s}$.

From the choice of the constants and Propositions 5 and 6 we know that the inequality (4.5) with the "new " ϕ holds on $\partial\Delta_\delta$:

Indeed if $x \in \partial\Omega$, $y \in \Omega$, and $(t,s) \in]0,T[^2$, $|s-t| < \delta$, using Proposition 6, one has

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) - u(y,s) &\leq \psi(x,t) - \psi(x,s) + u(x,s) - u(y,s) \\ &\leq |\psi_t|_\infty |t-s| + C_1|x-y|^\gamma \end{aligned}$$

which gives the result since $M \geq C_2 \geq |\psi_t|_\infty$ and $L \geq C_1$. The same is true by exchanging x and y.

If $|x-y| = \delta$ or $|t-s| = \delta$, the result holds by the choice of L and M. For $t = 0$ or $s = 0$, one uses proposition 5 and proposition 6 to get $|u(x,t) - u(y,0)| \leq |u(x,t) - u(x,0)| + |u(x,0) - u(y,0)| \leq c_\psi |x-y|^\gamma + C_2 t^{\gamma^\star}$, from which we conclude since $L > c_\psi$ and $M > C_2 T$.

Finally the supremum cannot be achieved on $t = T$ or $s = T$ since in that case the function is $-\infty$.

Suppose by contradiction that

$$\sup_{(x,t),(y,s)\in Q_T^2} \Phi(x,t,y,s) > 0.$$

Then for $n > 0$ large enough

$$\Phi_n(x,t,y,s) = u(x,t) - u(y,s) - L|x-y|^\gamma - M(|t-s|^2 + n^{-2})^{\frac{\gamma^\star}{2}} - \frac{\kappa}{T-t} - \frac{\kappa}{T-s}$$

has also a supremum > 0, and it cannot be achieved on the boundary, by the previous considerations. We denote for simplicity by $(\bar{x}_n, \bar{t}_n), (\bar{y}_n, \bar{s}_n)$ a couple inside Δ_δ on which the supremum of ψ_n is achieved. In the following we fix n large enough and drop the indexes n for simplicity.

Suppose that $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$. Then one would have

$$u(\bar{x},t) - u(\bar{x},s) \geq M((t-s)^2 + \frac{1}{n^2})^{\frac{\gamma^\star}{2}},$$

which contradicts proposition 5 and the choice of M. Hence $\bar{x} \neq \bar{y}$ and using Ishiis' lemma (see also lemma 2.1 in [2]), there exists $X \in S$ and Y in S such that:

$$\left(M\gamma^\star\frac{\bar t-\bar s}{((\bar t-\bar s)^2+\frac{1}{n^2})^{1-\frac{\gamma^\star}{2}}}+\frac{\kappa}{(T-\bar t)^2},\gamma L(\bar x-\bar y)|\bar x-\bar y|^{\gamma-2},X\right)\in J^{2,+}u(\bar x,\bar t)$$

$$\left(M\gamma^\star\frac{\bar t-\bar s}{((\bar t-\bar s)^2+\frac{1}{n^2})^{1-\frac{\gamma^\star}{2}}}-\frac{\kappa}{(T-\bar s)^2},\gamma L(\bar x-\bar y)|\bar x-\bar y|^{\gamma-2},-Y\right)\in J^{2,-}u(\bar y,\bar s)$$

with

$$\begin{pmatrix} X & 0\\ 0 & Y\end{pmatrix}\le\begin{pmatrix} B & -B\\ -B & B\end{pmatrix}$$

and $B=L\gamma|x-y|^{\gamma-2}(I+(\gamma-2)\frac{(x-y)\otimes(x-y)}{|x-y|^2})=D^2(|X|^\gamma)(x-y)$.

We need a more precise estimate, as in [14]. For that aim let P be defined as :

$$0\le P:=\frac{(\bar x-\bar y\otimes\bar x-\bar y)}{|\bar x-\bar y|^2}\le I.$$

Using $-(X+Y)\ge 0$, $(I-P)\ge 0$ and the properties of the symmetric matrices one has

$$tr(X+Y)\le tr(P(X+Y)).$$

Remarking in addition that $X+Y\le 4B$, one sees that $tr(X+Y)\le tr(P(X+Y))\le 4tr(PB)$. But $tr(PB)=\gamma L(\gamma-1)|\bar x-\bar y|^{\gamma-2}<0$, hence

$$|tr(X+Y)|\ge 4\gamma L(1-\gamma)|\bar x-\bar y|^{\gamma-2}. \tag{4.6}$$

Furthermore by Lemma III.1 of [14] there exists a universal constant C such that

$$|X|,|Y|\le C(|tr(X+Y)|+|B|^{\frac12}|tr(X+Y)|^{\frac12})\le C|tr(X+Y)| \tag{4.7}$$

since $|B|$ and $|tr(X+Y)|$ are of the same order. This constant is the constant used for the choice of L chosen at the beginning of the proof.

Using the fact that u is both a sub- and a supersolution we get

$$f(\bar x,\bar t)\quad\ge\quad M\gamma^\star\left(\frac{\bar t-\bar s}{((\bar t-\bar s)^2+\frac{1}{n^2})^{1-\frac{\gamma^\star}{2}}}\right)+\frac{\kappa}{(T-\bar t)^2}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
- &\quad F(\bar{x}, \gamma L(\bar{x}-\bar{y})|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|^{\gamma-2}, X) \\
- &\quad L^{1+\alpha}\gamma^{1+\alpha} h(\bar{x},\bar{t}) \cdot (\bar{x}-\bar{y})|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|^{(\gamma-1)(\alpha+1)-1} \\
\geq &\quad M\gamma^{\star}\left(\frac{\bar{t}-\bar{s}}{((\bar{t}-\bar{s})^2+\frac{1}{n^2})^{1-\frac{\gamma^{\star}}{2}}}\right) - \frac{\kappa}{(T-\bar{s})^2} - F(\bar{y}, (\gamma L(\bar{x}-\bar{y})|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|^{\gamma-2}, -Y) \\
- &\quad L^{1+\alpha}\gamma^{1+\alpha} h(\bar{y},\bar{s}) \cdot (\bar{x}-\bar{y})|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|^{(\gamma-1)(\alpha+1)-1} - \tilde{\omega}(|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|)(\gamma L|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|^{\gamma-1})^{\alpha}|X| \\
- &\quad L^{1+\alpha}|h|_{\infty}\gamma^{1+\alpha}|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|^{(\gamma)(\alpha+1)} + (\gamma L|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|^{\gamma-1})^{\alpha} a|tr(X+Y)| \\
\geq &\quad f(\bar{y},\bar{s}) + 4\gamma^{1+\alpha}L^{1+\alpha}(1-\gamma)|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|^{\gamma-2+(\gamma-1)(\alpha+1)}(a - \frac{\tilde{\omega}}{C}(|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|) - \frac{|h|_{\infty}}{4C}|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|)
\end{aligned}
$$

which is a contradiction with the assumptions on L. We have obtained that

$$
u(x,t) - u(y,s) \leq L|x-y|^{\gamma} + M\frac{|t-s|^{\gamma^{\star}}}{T-t}.
$$

This ends the proof.

5 Maximal solutions on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$

In this section we prove the existence of solutions on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$. For this we prove some property of solutions when $t \to T$ and we use Zorn's lemma.

Proposition 7 *We suppose that f is continuous and bounded on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$. Suppose that u is a supersolution of $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$ on Q_T, lower semicontinuous, and we define*

$$
u(x,T) = \liminf_{|z-x|+|t-T|\leq r} u(z,t).
$$

Then u being extended in that kind is a supersolution on $\Omega\times]0,T]$.

In the same manner if v is a upper semicontinuous sub-solution, we define

$$
v(x,T) = \limsup_{|z-x|+|t-T|\leq r} v(z,t).
$$

Then v being extended in that kind is a sub-solution on $\Omega\times]0,T]$.

Proof

We follow partly the process employed in [18].

Let u be a supersolution and let φ be a $\mathcal{C}^2$ function such that

$$
(u-\varphi)(x,t) \geq (u-\varphi)(\bar{x},T)
$$

for (x,t) on some neighborhood V of $(\bar{x},T)$, $\nabla_x\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{t}) \neq 0$. One can assume replacing if necessary $\varphi(x,t)$ by $\varphi(x,t)-|x-\bar{x}|^k-|t-T|^2$ for $k>\sup(2,\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1})$, that the infimum of $(u-\varphi)$ is strict on $(\bar{x},T)$.

Then for n large enough

$$\inf_{(x,t)\in V}\left(u(x,t)-\varphi(x,t)+\frac{1}{n(T-t)}\right)$$

is achieved on (y_n,t_n) with $(y_n,t_n)\to(\bar{x},T)$.

Indeed we prove first that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\inf_{(x,t)\in V}\left(u(x,t)-\varphi(x,t)+\frac{1}{n(T-t)}\right)=\inf_{(x,t)\in V}(u-\varphi)(x,t).$$

We already have

$$\inf_{(x,t)\in V}\left(u(x,t)-\varphi(x,t)+\frac{1}{n(T-t)}\right)\geq\inf(u-\varphi)(x,t).$$

For the reverse inequality let ϵ be given and (x_ϵ,t_ϵ) in Q_T with

$$(u-\varphi)(x_\epsilon,t_\epsilon)\leq\inf_{(x,t)\in V}(u-\varphi)(x,t)+\epsilon$$

then for $n(T-t_\epsilon)>\frac{1}{\epsilon}$

$$(u-\varphi)(x_\epsilon,t_\epsilon)+\frac{1}{n(T-t_\epsilon)}\leq(u-\varphi)(x_\epsilon,t_\epsilon)+2\epsilon\leq\inf_{(x,t)\in V}(u-\varphi)+2\epsilon.$$

ϵ being arbitrary, one gets the result.

Now the function $u-\varphi+\frac{1}{n(T-t)}$ being lower semi-continuous the infimum is achieved on some (y_n,t_n). By the previous considerations

$$\inf_{(x,t)\in V}(u-\varphi)(x,t)\leq(u-\varphi)(y_n,t_n)+\frac{1}{n(T-t_n)}\to(u-\varphi)(\bar{x},T)$$

This implies in particular that

$$(u-\varphi)(y_n,t_n)\to(u-\varphi)(\bar{x},T)$$

and since the infimum of $u-\varphi$ is strict, $(y_n,t_n)\to(\bar{x},T)$. Let us note that t_n does not go to T too quickly, since $n(T-t_n)\to+\infty$.

Let $\varphi_n = \varphi(x,t) - \frac{1}{n(T-t)}$, since φ is $\mathcal{C}^1$, for n large enough, $\nabla_x \varphi_n(y_n,t_n) \neq 0$, and since φ_n achieves u by below on (y_n,t_n),

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varphi_n(y_n,t_n) - F(y_n, \nabla\varphi(y_n,t_n), D^2\varphi(y_n,t_n)) - h(y_n)\cdot\nabla\varphi(y_n)|\nabla\varphi(y_n)|^\alpha \geq f(y_n,t_n),$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\varphi(y_n,t_n) &- F(y_n, \nabla\varphi(y_n,t_n), D^2\varphi(y_n,t_n)) - h(y_n)\cdot\nabla\varphi(y_n)|\nabla\varphi(y_n)|^\alpha \\ &\geq f(y_n,t_n) + \frac{1}{n(T-t)^2} \\ &\geq f(y_n,t_n),\end{aligned}$$

and passing to the limit one gets that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varphi(\bar{x},T) - F(\bar{x}, \nabla\varphi, D^2\varphi)(\bar{x},T) - h(\bar{x})\cdot\nabla\varphi(\bar{x},T)|\nabla\varphi(\bar{x},T)|^\alpha \geq f(\bar{x},T).$$

This ends the case $\nabla_x\varphi(\bar{x},T) \neq 0$.

We now assume that there exists some $\mathcal{C}^1$ function φ which depends only on t, and some $\delta_1 > 0$ such that $u(\bar{x},T) - \varphi(T) = \inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}(u(x,t) - \varphi(t))$ and $\inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}\{u(x,t) - \varphi(t)\}$ is constant in a neighborhood $B(\bar{x},\delta)$ of $\bar{x}$. Then one also has

$$\inf_{x\in B(\bar{x},\delta), |t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}\{u(x,t) - \varphi(t) + |x-\bar{x}|^k + |t-T|^2\} = u(\bar{x},T) - \varphi(T)$$

Defining $\varphi_n(t) = \varphi(t) - |x-\bar{x}|^k - |t-T|^2 - \frac{1}{n(T-t)}$ one gets also that there exists (x_n,t_n) which converges to $(\bar{x},T)$ and (x_n,t_n) is a local minimum for $u - \varphi_n$.

- Either $x_n = \bar{x}$ for all n large enough, then using lemma 1 one gets

$$\partial_t\varphi(t_n) - 2(t_n - T) - \frac{1}{n(T-t_n)^2} \geq f(\bar{x},t_n).$$

which yields the result by passing to the limit.

-Or for an infinity of n, $x_n \neq \bar{x}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\varphi(t_n) - 2(t_n - T) - \frac{1}{n(T-t_n)^2} &- F(-k|x_n-\bar{x}|^{k-2}(x_n-\bar{x}), -D^2(|\bar{x}-x|^k)(x_n)) \\ &+ k^{1+\alpha}h(x_n)\cdot(x_n-\bar{x})|x_n-\bar{x}|^{(k-1)(\alpha-1)-1} \\ &\geq f(x_n,t_n).\end{aligned}$$

Since $|\bar{x}-x_n|$ and $|t_n-T|$ tend to zero when n goes to infinity, and $k > \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1}$, one gets by passing to the limit that

$$\varphi'(T) \geq f(\bar{x}, T).$$

We can now use Zorn's axiom to get the existence of maximal solutions on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$ for the problem $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$.

Moreover one can prove using uniform Holder's estimates that the solutions are locally Holder's on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$. We do not give the proof which uses both some arguments in the Holder's proof for $\Omega \times]0, T[$ and some arguments specific to the non bounded cases, as those used for the case of $\mathbb{R}^N$ in theorem 3 later.

6 The case $\mathbb{R}^N \times]0, T[$

For completeness sake we are going to prove some existence's result for the equation in $\mathbb{R}^N \times]0, T[$ when f is uniformly continuous and bounded on $\mathbb{R}^N \times]0, T[$, Holder's continuous in t, uniformly w.r.t. x, and ψ is Hölderian for some exponent γ_ψ and uniformly bounded on $\mathbb{R}^N$. We assume in addition that F satisfies the uniform Lipschitz condition :

$(H6)$ There exists some constant C such that for all $p \neq 0$, for all X and for all q, such that $|q| < \frac{|p|}{2}$, one has

$$|F(x, p+q, X) - F(x, p, X)| \leq C|p|^{\alpha-1}|q||X|$$

We prove the existence of viscosity solutions of

$$\begin{cases} u_t - F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) - h(x,t) \cdot \nabla u |\nabla u|^\alpha = f(x,t) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times]0, T[\\ u(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^N \times \{0\} \end{cases}$$

We will construct a supersolution and a sub-solution and use Perron's method to conclude.

To construct a supersolution, we use the following proposition

Proposition 8 *There exists G, some positive $\mathcal{C}^2$ function on $[0, \infty[$, and some constant B such that $u(x) = G(|x|)$ satisfies on $\mathbb{R}^N \times]0, T[$*

$$F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) + h(x,t) \cdot \nabla u |\nabla u|^\alpha \leq B.$$

Proof: If $\alpha \geq 0$ let G be defined as

$$G(r) = \begin{cases} r^2 & \text{if } r < 1 \\ (r-1)(3-\frac{1}{r})+1 & \text{if } r \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

In the case where $\alpha < 0$, we recall that $q_1 = \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1}$, $q = \frac{q_1}{\gamma_\psi}$, and define

$$G(r) = \begin{cases} r^{q_1} & \text{if } r < 1 \\ \frac{q_1(1+q_1)r}{2} + \frac{q_1(q_1-1)}{2r} + 1 - q_1^2 & \text{if } r > 1. \end{cases}$$

With this choice of G by a tedious but straithforward computation there exists some constant B such that for $u(x) = G(|x|)$

$$F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) + h(x,t) \cdot \nabla u |\nabla u|^\alpha \leq B.$$

We now define on the model of W_2 in section 3,

$$W(x,t) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}^+} \{\psi(y) + \kappa + \frac{(c_\psi + 2|\psi|_\infty)^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}} G(|y-x|) + |f|_\infty t + \left(\frac{(c_\psi + 2|\psi|_\infty)^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}\right)^{1+\alpha} Bt\}$$

Then W is an infimum of supersolutions for $1_{\{|f|_\infty\}}$
Moreover

$$W(x,0) = \inf_{\{|y-x|<1, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}^+\}} (\psi(y) + \kappa + \frac{(c_\psi + 2|\psi]_\infty)^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}} G(|x-y|) \geq \psi(y) + c_\psi |x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} \geq \psi(x)$$

and also using $G(r) \geq r$ for $t \geq 1$

$$\inf_{|y-x|>1} \{\psi(y) + (c_\psi + 2|\psi|_\infty)|y-x|^{\frac{1}{q}}\} \geq \psi(y) + 2|\psi|_\infty \geq \psi(x).$$

This implies that $W(x,0) \geq \psi(x)$. Moreover taking $y = x$ in the infimum, one gets

$$W(x,0) \leq \kappa + \psi(x),$$

for all κ. We have obtained that $W(x,0) = \psi(x)$. We now observe that W is uniformly bounded, indeed

$$\begin{aligned} W(x,t) &\leq \inf_{|x|<1} \{\psi(x) + \kappa + |f|_\infty t + \left(\frac{(c_\psi + 2|\psi|_\infty)^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}\right)^{1+\alpha} Bt\} \\ &\leq \psi(x) + ct^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}} \\ &\leq |\psi|_\infty + cT^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

We do not give explicitely c which can be computed using (3.4), replacing q by $(q-1)(\alpha+1)+1$. Moreover there exists c_1 and c_2 such that

$$W(x,t) \leq \psi(y) + c_1(|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi}) + c_2 t^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}}$$

Indeed

$$W(x,t) \leq \psi(x) + ct^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}} \leq \psi(y) + c_\psi |x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} + ct^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}}.$$

Let us note that

$$V(x,t) = \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N, \kappa\in\mathbb{R}^+} \{\psi(y,0) - \kappa - \frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}} G(|y-x|) - |f|_\infty t - \left(\frac{c_\psi^q}{c_q^q \kappa^{q-1}}\right)^{1+\alpha} Bt\}$$

with B as before , is a sub-solution of $1_{\{-|f|_\infty, \psi\}}$. Moreover V is bounded and satisfies for some constants c_1 and c_2

$$V(x,t) \geq \psi(y) - c_1|x-y|^\gamma - c_2 t^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}}.$$

A first crucial step for the existence of solutions for the Dirichlet problem is some comparison theorem on $\mathbb{R}^N \times]0,T[$. This will also permit to get the uniqueness and later the regularity of the solutions.

Theorem 3 *Suppose that f and g are uniformly continuous and bounded and $f \geq g$. Suppose that u and v are respectively uppersemicontinuous and lower semicontinuous sub-and supersolutions of*

$$u_t - F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) - h(x,t)\cdot \nabla u |\nabla u|^\alpha \leq g(x,t) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \times]0,T[$$

$$v_t - F(x, \nabla v, D^2 v) - b(x,t)\cdot \nabla v |\nabla v|^\alpha \geq f(x,t) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \times]0,T[$$

with $u(x,0) \leq v(x,0)$, $x \mapsto u(x,0)$ and $x \mapsto v(x,0)$ being Holder's continuous and bounded. Suppose in addition that there exist some constant c_1, such that for all x, y in $\mathbb{R}^N$

$$u(x,t) \leq u(y,0) + c_1(|x-y|+1)$$

$$v(x,t) \geq v(y,0) - c_1(|x-y|+1)$$

Then $u(x,t) \leq v(x,t)$.

We postpone the proof of theorem 3 and derive from it some consequences.

First the estimates on V and W imply that $V \leq W$. Then using Perron's method in section 4, which proof does not use the boundedness of Ω, we obtain that there exists a solution of $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \times]0,T[$, in the sense that $u^\star$ is a sub-solution and $u_\star$ is a supersolution. We now use the fact that $V \leq u^\star$ and $u_\star \leq W$ to derive that there exist c_1 and c_2 such that

$$u_\star(x,t) \leq \psi(y) + c_1|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} + c_2 t^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}}$$

$$u^\star(x,t) \geq \psi(y) - c_1|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} - c_2 t^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}}$$

From these estimates, using theorem 3 one gets that $u_\star \geq u^\star$, hence u is continuous. Applying once more theorem 3 one gets that the solution is unique.

Proof of theorem 3

One can replace v by $(v)_\kappa = v + \frac{\kappa}{T-t}$. Then v_κ is a strict supersolution, which is infinite on $t = T$.

We shall prove that $u \leq v_\kappa$ and next we shall let κ go to zero. In the following we drop the index κ .

Suppose by contradiction that there exists $(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$ such that $(u-v)(\bar{x},\bar{t}) > 0$. Then $\bar{t} < T$ according to the previous property of v.

We introduce for $j \in \mathbf{N}$ and for $k = \sup(3, \frac{|\alpha|}{3}, \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1}, \alpha+1, \frac{\alpha+2}{6}, \frac{2(1+\alpha)}{\omega_h})$, the function ψ_j defined as

$$\psi_j(x,y,t,s) = u(x,t) - v(y,s) - \frac{j|x-y|^k}{k} - \frac{1}{j^{3k}}|x|^k - \frac{j}{2}|t-s|^2$$

Then for j large enough the supremum of ψ_j is still > 0, for example as soon as

$$j^{3k} > \frac{|\bar{x}|^k}{u(\bar{x},\bar{t}) - v(\bar{x},\bar{t})}$$

In the following C will denote some constant which can vary from one line to another.

We prove first that if $\psi_j(x_j,y_j,t_j,s_j) > 0$, $j|x_j - y_j|^k \leq C$. Indeed one has for $j^{3k} > \frac{|\bar{x}|^k}{(u(\bar{x},\bar{t}) - v(\bar{x},\bar{t}))}$, $\psi_j(x_j,y_j,t_j,s_j) \geq 0$ and then using $u(x,t) \leq u(y,0) + c_1(|x-y|+1)$ and

$$v(y,t) \geq v(y,0) - c_1,$$

one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{j|x_j-y_j|^k}{k} &\leq c_1(|x_j-y_j|+2)\\ &\leq \frac{j|x_j-y_j|^k}{2k}+C,\end{aligned}$$

and then $j|x_j-y_j|^k$ is bounded.

In particular $|x_j-y_j|$ goes to zero. From this one also derives that

$$\frac{|x_j|^k}{j^{3k}}+\frac{j|t_j-s_j|^2}{2}\leq C,$$

and then $|x_j|\leq\sqrt{C}j^3$

Moreover using Ishii's lemma [13], (see also lemma 2.1 in [2]) there exist $(X_j,Y_j)\in\mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\left(j(t_j-s_j),j|x_j-y_j|^{k-2}(x_j-y_j)+\frac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}},X_j+\frac{D^2(|x|^k)(x_j)}{j^{3k}}\right)\in J^{2,+}u(x_j,t_j)$$

$$\left(j(t_j-s_j),j|x_j-y_j|^{k-2}(x_j-y_j),-Y_j\right)\in J^{2,-}v(y_j,s_j)$$

Suppose that $x_j=y_j$. We prove then that $x_j\neq 0$. If it was the case the function $\varphi(x,t)=u(0,t_j)+\frac{j}{k}|x|^k+\frac{|x|^k}{j^{3k}}+\frac{j}{2}(t-s_j)^2-\frac{j}{2}(s_j-t_j)^2$ would touch u by above on 0 and then using lemma 1 one would obtain since $k>\sup(2,\frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1})$

$$j(t_j-s_j)-0\leq g(0,t_j).$$

On the other hand since $-\frac{j}{2}(t-t_j)^2+\frac{j}{2}(s_j-t_j)^2-\frac{j|x|^k}{k}$ touches v by below on $(0,s_j)$, using once more lemma 1 we get

$$j(t_j-s_j)-0\geq f(0,s_j)+\frac{\kappa}{(T-s_j)^2}$$

Using $|t_j-s_j|\to 0$, the uniform continuity of f and g , substracting the two inequalities and passing to the limit we get a contradiction.

We now suppose that $x_j=y_j$ and we know that under this assumption, $x_j\neq 0$. Then the function $\varphi(x,t)=v(x_j,s_j)+\frac{j}{k}|x-x_j|^k+\frac{|x|^k}{j^{3k}}+\frac{j}{2}(t-s_j)^2-\frac{j}{2}(s_j-t_j)^2$ achieves u by above on x_j, where its gradient is different from 0. We then have

$$j(t_j-s_j)-F(\frac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}},D^2(\frac{|x|^k}{j^{3k}}))(x_j)-\left(h(x_j,t_j)\cdot\frac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}}\right)\left(\frac{|k|x_j|^{k-1}}{j^{3k}}\right)^{\alpha}\leq g(x_j,t_j),$$

and for v one uses once more lemma 1, to get that

$$j(t_j - s_j) - 0 \geq f(x_j, s_j) + \frac{\kappa}{(T - s_j)^2},$$

We now use the properties of F to get that

$$\begin{aligned} |F(\frac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}}, D^2\frac{(|x|^k)}{j^{3k}}(x_j))) &+ \left(h(x_j,t_j)\cdot\frac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}}\right)\left(\frac{k|x_j|^{k-1}}{j^{3k}}\right)^\alpha | \\ &\leq C\left(\frac{|x_j|^{k(\alpha+1)-\alpha-2}}{j^{3k(1+\alpha)}} + \frac{|x_j|^{(k-1)(\alpha+1)}}{j^{3k(1+\alpha)}}\right) \\ &\leq C\left(j^{3(k(\alpha+1)-\alpha-2)-3k(1+\alpha)} + j^{-3(\alpha+1)}\right) \\ &= o(1) \end{aligned}$$

Finally using the fact that $|x_j - y_j| + |t_j - s_j|$ goes to zero, the uniform continuity of f and g , substracting the two equations and passing to the limit we get a contradiction.

We have obtained that $x_j \neq y_j$.

We now prove that $j^2|x_j - y_j|^{k-1} \to +\infty$. In particular this will imply that for j large enough $j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j) + k\frac{|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}} \neq 0$. Suppose by contradiction that for some constant $c > 0$, $j|x_j - y_j|^{k-1} \leq cj^{-1}$ then $|X_j| \leq j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2} \leq (j^2|x_j - y_j|^{k-1})^{\frac{k-2}{k-1}} j^{\frac{3-k}{k-1}} \to 0$ and also $|X_j| + |D^2\left(\frac{|x|^k}{j^{3k}}\right)(x_j)| \leq |X_j| + cj^{-6} \to 0$. Using the fact that u and v are respectively sub-and supersolution, one has

$$\begin{aligned} g(x_j, t_j) &\geq j(t_j - s_j) - o(1) \\ \text{and } \frac{\kappa}{T^2} + f(y_j, s_j) &\leq j(t_j - s_j) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Substracting the two inequalities, passing to the limit and using the properties of f and g, one gets a contradiction. We have obtained that $j|x_j - y_j|^{k-1} \geq \frac{c}{j}$ for some constant c. From this one derives that $j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j) + \frac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}} \sim_{j\to+\infty} j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j)$. With the aid of this remark and using the assumption $(H6)$

$$\begin{aligned} | \quad & F(j|x_j - y_j|^{q-2}(x_j - y_j) + \frac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}}, X_j) - F(j|x_j - y_j|^{q-2}(x_j - y_j), X_j)| \\ \leq \quad & cj^{-3}|X_j|(j|x_j - y_j|^{k-1})^{\alpha-1} \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
\leq & \left\{ \begin{array}{cl} cj^{-\alpha-1}|x_j - y_j|^{k-2} & \text{if } \alpha < 1 \\ cj^{-3+\frac{\alpha+1}{k}}(j|x_j - y_j|^k)^{\alpha - \frac{\alpha+1}{k}} & \text{if } \alpha \geq 1 \end{array} \right. \\
= & o(1)
\end{array}
$$

by the choice of k. One also has using the assumption (H2)

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
| & F((j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j) + \dfrac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}}, X_j + \dfrac{D^2(|x|^k)}{j^{3k}}(x_j)) - F((j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j) \\
+ & \dfrac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}}, X_j)| \\
\leq & cj^{-6}(j|x_j - y_j|^{k-1})^{\alpha} \\
\leq & \left\{ \begin{array}{cl} cj^{-6-\alpha} & \text{if } \alpha < 0 \\ cj^{-6+\frac{\alpha}{k}}(j|x_j - y_j|^k)^{\alpha(\frac{k-1}{k})} & \text{if } \alpha \geq 0 \end{array} \right. \\
= & o(1)
\end{array}
$$

by the choice of k.

Treating analogously the terms involving h, in particular using the Hölder's regularity of h with respect to t, together with (H3), one obtains

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
& g(x_j, t_j) \geq j(t_j - s_j) - F(j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j) + \dfrac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}}, X_j + \dfrac{D^2(|x|^k)(x_j)}{j^{3k}}) \\
- & h(x_j, t_j) \cdot \left(j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j) + \dfrac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}} \right) \left| j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j) + \dfrac{k|x_j|^{k-2}x_j}{j^{3k}} \right|^{\alpha} \\
\geq & j(t_j - s_j) - F(x_j, j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j), X_j) \\
- & h(x_j, t_j) \cdot j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j)|j|x_j - y_j|^{k-1}|^{\alpha} - o(1) \\
\geq & j(t_j - s_j) - F(y_j, j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j), -Y_j) \\
- & h(y_j, s_j) \cdot j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j)|j|x_j - y_j|^{k-2}(x_j - y_j)|^{\alpha}| \\
& -o(1) \\
\geq & f(y_j, s_j) + \dfrac{\kappa}{T^2} - o(1)
\end{array}
$$

We now conclude as before : We use the fact that $|x_j - y_j| + |t_j - s_j|$ goes to zero, the uniform continuity of f and g , and we pass to the limit to get a contradiction.

This ends the proof of theorem 3.

We now prove that the solutions are Hölder's continuous.

Proposition 9 *Suppose that u is a solution of $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^N\times]0,T[$. Suppose that there exist some constant c_1 and c_2 such that*

$$u(x,t) \leq \psi(y) + c_1|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} + c_2 t^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}} \tag{6.8}$$

$$u(x,t) \geq \psi(y) - c_1|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} - c_2 t^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}} \tag{6.9}$$

We assume that f is uniformly continuous and bounded, is γ_f Hölderian with respect to t, uniformly in x, and that ψ is Hölderian of exponent γ_ψ on $\mathbb{R}^N$ and bounded, then u is Holder's continuous of exponent γ_ψ with respect to x and of exponent $\gamma^\star = \inf(\gamma_f, \frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha})$ with respect to t on every compact set of $\mathbb{R}^N\times]0,T[$.

We shall need the following proposition, which proves some Holder's regularity with respect to t, when x is fixed.

Proposition 10 *Under the assumptions of Proposition 9 there exists some constant C_2 such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and for all $t, s > 0$*

$$|u(x,t+s) - u(x,t)| \leq C_2 s^{\gamma^\star}$$

where $\gamma^\star = \inf(\gamma_f, \frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha})$, $q = \frac{q_1}{\gamma_\psi}$, $q_1 = \sup(2, \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1})$.

Proof We first use the estimates (6.8) and (6.9) which give for $y = x$:

$$|\psi(x) - u(x,s)| \leq c_2 s^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}}$$

and the comparison principle in Theorem 3 on $\mathbb{R}^N\times]0,T[$: We define fro s fixed in $[0,T]$ and $t \in [0, T-s]$

$$v(x,t) = u(x,t+s) + c_f t s^{\gamma_f} + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} |\psi(x) - u(x,s)|.$$

where c_f is some Holder's constant of f with respect to t. Then v is a supersolution of $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \times [0, T-s[$. Let us note that v and u have the properties

$$u(x,t) \leq \psi(y) + c_1|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} + c_2 t^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}} \leq \psi(y) + 2c_1(|x-y|+1) + c_2 T^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}} \tag{6.10}$$

and

$$v(x,t) \geq \psi(y) - c_1|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} - c_2(t+s)^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}} \geq \psi(y) - 2c_1(|x-y|+1) - c_2(2T)^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}} \tag{6.11}$$

and $u(x,0) \leq v(x,0)$ by construction.

Hence one can apply the comparison theorem 3 to obtain that

$$u(x,t) \leq v(x,t) + \sup_{x\in\Omega} |u(x,0) - v(x,0)| \leq u(x,t+s) + c_f T s^{\gamma_f} + c_2 s^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-\alpha}}$$

In the same manner defining $v(x,t) = u(x,t+s) - c_f t s^{\gamma_f} - \sup_x |\psi(x) - u(x,s)|$ then $u(x,t)$ and v are super and sub-solution for the same equation, and then using theorem 3 one gets

$$u(x,t) \geq u(x,t+s) - c_f T s^{\gamma_f} - c_2 s^{\frac{1}{q(\alpha+1)-1}}.$$

The result follows.

Proof of proposition 9

First we observe that u is bounded, taking $y = x$ in the inequalities (6.8) and (6.9) and using the fact that ψ is bounded.

Let δ be given less than 1, $L > \sup(4c_1 + L_\psi, \left(\frac{4|f|_\infty}{\gamma_\psi^{1+\alpha}(1-\gamma_\psi)}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}})$ and $M \geq \sup(\frac{2\sup u}{\delta^{\gamma^\star}}, c_2, \frac{2c_2 T^{\gamma^\star}}{\delta^{\gamma^\star}})$. We define the set

$$\Delta_\delta = \{(x,y,t,s), |x-y| < \delta, |t-s| < \delta, (t,s) \in]0,T[\}$$

and for j large the function

$$\psi_j(x,y,t,s) = u(x,t) - u(y,s) - L|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} - \frac{|x|^2}{2j^2} - M|t-s|^{\gamma^\star}.$$

We shall prove that for j large enough, ψ_j is ≤ 0. The result will follow by passing to the limit on each compact set of $\mathbb{R}^N \times]0,T[$.

We then assume by contradiction that ψ_j has a maximum strictly positive. Then for κ small enough

$$\psi_j - \frac{\kappa}{T-t} - \frac{\kappa}{T-s}$$

has also its supremum strictly positive and we begin to observe that on the boundary of Δ_δ, this function is ≤ 0.

Indeed in the case where $|t-s|=\delta$ then by hypothesis (6.8) and (6.9)

$$u(x,t)-u(y,s) \le c_1|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} + 2c_2 T^{\gamma^\star} \le L|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} + M|t-s|^{\gamma^\star}$$

In the case where $t=0$, $s>0$ and $|x-y|\le\delta$ one uses once more (6.8) and (6.9).

Finally the supremum cannot be achieved for $t=T$ or $s=T$.

Let us note that if ψ_j has a supremum >0,

$$\psi_j^n(x,t,y,s) = u(x,t)-u(y,s)-L|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi} - \frac{|x|^2}{2j^2} - M(\frac{1}{n^2}+[t-s|^2)^{\frac{\gamma^\star}{2}} - \frac{\kappa}{T-t} - \frac{\kappa}{T-s}$$

has also a supremum >0 achieved inside Δ_δ, for n large enough. We fix n large enough. Let (x_j,y_j,t_j,s_j) be a point where the supremum of ψ_n is achieved. By the previous considerations, it cannot be achieved on the boundary. By proposition 10 one has $x_j \ne y_j$ and then the function $|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi}$ is $\mathcal{C}^2$ on a neighborhood of (x_j,y_j). Using Ishii's lemma (see also Lemma 2.1 in [2]) we have the existence of (X_j,Y_j) with

$$\Big(\gamma^\star M(t_j-s_j)(\frac{1}{n^2}+|t_j-s_j|^2)^{1-\frac{\gamma^\star}{2}} + \frac{\kappa}{(T-t_j)^2},$$
$$\gamma_\psi L(x_j-y_j)|x_j-y_j|^{\gamma_\psi-2} + \frac{x_j}{j^2}, X_j + \frac{I}{j^2}\Big) \in J^{2,+}u(x_j,t_j)$$

$$\begin{aligned}(\gamma^\star M(t_j-s_j)(\frac{1}{n^2}+|t_j-s_j|^2)^{1-\frac{\gamma^\star}{2}} &- \frac{\kappa}{(T-s_j)^2}, \gamma_\psi L(x_j-y_j)|x_j-y_j|^{\gamma_\psi-2}, -Y_j) \\ &\in J^{2,-}u(y_j,s_j)\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{pmatrix} X_j & 0 \\ 0 & Y_j \end{pmatrix} \le \begin{pmatrix} B(x_j,y_j) & -B(x_j,y_j) \\ -B(x_j,y_j) & B(x_j,y_j) \end{pmatrix}$$

with $B(x,y) = L\gamma_\psi|x-y|^{\gamma_\psi-2}(I+(\gamma_\psi-2)\frac{(x-y)\otimes(x-y)}{|x-y|^2}) = D^2(|X|^{\gamma_\psi})(x-y)$

Let us observe that due to the hypothesis, $|\frac{x_j}{j^2}| \le \frac{c}{j} \le \frac{\gamma_\psi}{2L\delta^{\gamma_\psi-1}}$, and then $|\gamma_\psi L(x_j-y_j)|x_j-y_j|^{\gamma_\psi-2} + \frac{x_j}{j^2}| \ge \frac{\gamma_\psi}{2}L|x_j-y_j|^{\gamma_\psi-1}$.

We use as in the proof of theorem 2, the inequality

$$|tr(X_j+Y_j)| = -tr(X_j+Y_j) \ge 4\gamma_\psi(1-\gamma_\psi)L|x_j-y_j|^{\gamma_\psi-2}$$

and the fact that for some constant c

$$|X_j| + |Y_j| \leq c(|tr(X_j + Y_j)|$$

We then use the property (H6) of F to get that

$$\begin{aligned} |Fx_j, \gamma_\psi L(x_j - y_j)|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 2} & \quad + \frac{x_j}{j^2}, X_j + \frac{I}{j^2}) \\ & - \quad F(x_j, \gamma_\psi L(x_j - y_j)|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 2}, X_j)| \\ & \leq \quad O(j^{-1})(L|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 1})^{\alpha - 1}|X_j| + O(\frac{1}{j^2})(L|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 1})^{\alpha} \\ & \leq \quad o(1)(L|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 1})^{\alpha}|tr(X_j + Y_j)|. \end{aligned}$$

And we use only the fact that h is bounded to observe that

$$|h(x_j, t_j) - h(y_j, s_j) \cdot (\gamma_\psi L)^{1+\alpha}(x_j - y_j)|x_j - y_j|^{(1+\alpha)(\gamma_\psi - 1) - 1}| \leq o(1)(\gamma_\psi L|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 1})^{\alpha}|tr(X_j + Y_j)|$$

We now write

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_j, t_j) & \geq \gamma^\star M(t_j - s_j)(\frac{1}{n^2} + |t_j - s_j|^2)^{1 - \frac{\gamma^\star}{2}} + \frac{\kappa}{(T - t_j)^2} \\ & - F(x_j, \gamma_\psi L(x_j - y_j)|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 2} + \frac{x_j}{j^2}, X_j + \frac{I}{j^2}) \\ & - h(x_j, t_j) \cdot (\gamma_\psi L)^{1+\alpha}(x_j - y_j)|x_j - y_j|^{(1+\alpha)(\gamma_\psi - 1) - 1} \\ & \geq \gamma^\star M(t_j - s_j)(\frac{1}{n^2} + |t_j - s_j|^2)^{1 - \frac{\gamma^\star}{2}} - \frac{\kappa}{(T - s_j)^2} \\ & - F(y_j, \gamma_\psi L(x_j - y_j)|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 2}, -Y_j) \\ & - h(y_j, s_j) \cdot (\gamma_\psi L)^{1+\alpha}(x_j - y_j)|x_j - y_j|^{(1+\alpha)(\gamma_\psi - 1) - 1} \\ & \quad + (\gamma_\psi L|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 1})^{\alpha} tr(X_j + Y_j) + o(1)|\gamma_\psi L|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 1}|^{\alpha}(|tr(X_j + Y_j)|) \\ & \geq f(y_j, s_j) + (\gamma_\psi L|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 1})^{\alpha} tr(X_j + Y_j)(1 - o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

We have obtained a contradiction since this would imply that

$$(\gamma_\psi L|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 1})^{\alpha} L|x_j - y_j|^{\gamma_\psi - 2}(1 - o(1)) \leq 2|f|_\infty,$$

which is absurd by the choice of the constant L.
This ends the proof of the following Holder's result :

Proposition 11 *Suppose that ψ is Hölderian and bounded in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and that f is uniformly continuous and Holder's in t, uniformly w.r.t. x. Then, there exists a unique viscosity solution of $1_{\{f,\psi\}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^N\times]0,T[$. This solution is Holder's continuous on every compact set of $\mathbb{R}^N\times]0,T[$.*

Hence using Ascoli's theorem, we have also

Corollary 2 *Let $(f_n,\, \psi_n)$ be a sequence of bounded Holder's continuous functions, ψ_n being uniformly Holder's and (f_n) being uniformly Holder's in t, uniformly w.r.t. x. Then the sequence (u_n) of solutions of $1_{\{f_n,\psi_n\}}$ is relatively compact on every compact set of $\mathbb{R}^N\times]0,T[$.*

7 Appendix

In this appendix we prove that the solutions of Ohnuma and Sato in the case where $\alpha \neq 0$ are the same as our solutions. In the same manner we prove that it is also the case for the infinity Laplacian using the adapted definition of Evans and Spruck, and Juutinen and Kawhol.

7.1 The case $\alpha \neq 0$

The reader can consult [18] for the definition of $\mathcal{F}(F)$ and $\mathcal{A}(F)$.

We recall that in [18] the right hand side f is zero.

Proposition 12 *The solutions in our sense are the same as the solutions in the Ohnuma and Sato's sense.*

Proof

Suppose that u is a supersolution of $1_{\{0\}}$ in the Ohnuma and Sato's sense. Suppose that $(\bar{x},\bar{t})$ is some point such that for some δ_1 and for some $\mathcal{C}^1$ function φ on $]0,T[$:

$$\inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}(u(\bar{x},t)-\varphi(t)) = u(\bar{x},\bar{t})-\varphi(\bar{t}) = 0$$

and such that $x \mapsto \inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}(u(x,t)-\varphi(t))$ is constant on $B(\bar{x},\delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then in particular

$$\inf_{x\in B(\bar{x},\delta),|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}(u(x,t)-\varphi(t))$$

has its infimum equals to zero achieved on $(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$. Then, for $\epsilon > 0$ the function

$$h(x,t) = \varphi(\bar{t}) + \varphi'(\bar{t})(t-\bar{t}) + \frac{1}{2}(\varphi"(\bar{t}) - \epsilon)(t-\bar{t})^2$$

which belongs to $A(f)$, [18], satisfies

$$\inf_{(|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1, x\in B(\bar{x},\delta)}(u(x,t) - h(x,t)) = 0$$

Indeed

$$\inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1, x\in B(\bar{x},\delta)}(u-h)(x,t) \le u(\bar{x},\bar{t}) - \varphi(\bar{t}) = 0.$$

Moreover for t close to $\bar{t}$

$$\varphi(t) \ge \varphi(\bar{t}) + \varphi'(\bar{t})(t-\bar{t}) + \frac{1}{2}(\varphi"(\bar{t}) - \epsilon)(t-\bar{t})^2$$

hence

$$\inf_{(|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1, x\in B(\bar{x},\delta)}(u-h)(x,t) \ge \inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1, x\in B(\bar{x},\delta)}(u(x,t) - \varphi(t))$$

and then since u is a supersolution of $1_{\{0\}}$, $\varphi'(\bar{t}) \ge 0$ which is the desired conclusion.

We want to prove the reverse sense. We assume that u is a super solution in our sense. We suppose that $(\bar{x}, \bar{t})$ and φ are such that $(u-\varphi) \ge (u-\varphi)(\bar{x},\bar{t}) = 0$, with $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}(F)$.

Let $f \in \mathcal{F}(F)$ and ω be a continuous function such that $\omega(0) = 0$, $\omega(t-\bar{t}) = o(|t-\bar{t}|)$, be such that for $(x,t) \in V$ a neighborhood of $(\bar{x},\bar{t})$,

$$|\varphi(x,t) - \varphi(\bar{x},\bar{t}) - \partial_t\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{t})(t-\bar{t})| \le f(|x-\bar{x}|) + \omega(t-\bar{t})$$

Then

$$h(x,t) := \varphi(\bar{x},\bar{t}) + \partial_t\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{t})(t-\bar{t}) - f(|x-\bar{x}|) - \omega(t-\bar{t}) \le \varphi(x,t)$$

Moreover

$$\inf_{(x,t)\in V}(u(t,x) - h(x,t)) = 0$$

Indeed

$$\inf_{(x,t)\in V}(u(x,t) - h(x,t)) \le u(\bar{x},\bar{t}) - h(\bar{x},\bar{t})$$

secondly by the previous remark,

$$u - h \geq u - \varphi.$$

Now acting as in lemma 1 ie replacing $C_1|x-\bar{x}|^k$ by $f(|x-\bar{x}|)$ and $C_2|t-\bar{t}|^2$ by $\omega(|t-\bar{t}|)$ one gets since $\lim_{x\to 0} F(\nabla f, D^2 f)(|x|) = 0$ that $\partial_t \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) \geq 0$, which is the desired conclusion.

7.2 The case $\alpha = 0$ and the infinity Laplacian

We prove here that our definition is equivalent to the one of Evans and Spruck in the case of the infinity Laplacian (see also [17]).

We shall need the following lemma, whose proof is postponed for the sake of clearness.

Lemma 2 *Suppose that u is a supersolution of*

$$u_t - F(x, \nabla u, D^2 u) - h(x,t)\cdot \nabla u |\nabla u|^\alpha \geq f(x,t)$$

and suppose that φ is some $\mathcal{C}^2$ function on $]0,T[$, with $\varphi(\bar{t}) = 0$, that $k > \sup(2, \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1})$, that M is some symmetric matrix and $(0,\bar{t}) \in \Omega\times]0,T[$ are such that for some $\delta_1 > 0$

$$\inf_{x\in B(0,\delta_1), |t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1} (u(x,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}(Mx,x)) = u(0,\bar{t})$$

Then

$$\varphi'(\bar{t}) - \mathcal{M}^-_{a,A}(M) \geq f(0,\bar{t}).$$

We postpone the proof of Lemma 2

We now consider a supersolution u in our sense and assume that φ is some $\mathcal{C}^2$ function which achieves u by below on $(\bar{x},\bar{t})$ with $\nabla_x \varphi(\bar{x},\bar{t}) = 0$. We apply lemma 2 with $\bar{x}$ in place of 0, $\nabla_x\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{t}) = 0$ and replacing $\varphi(t)$by $\partial_t\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{t})(t-\bar{t})$, and $M = D^2\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{t})$ one gets the desired conclusion.

Proof of lemma 2:

For $C_2 > 0$ one still has

$$\inf_{x\in B(0,\delta_1), |t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1} (u(x,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}(Mx,x) + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2) = u(0,\bar{t})$$

and the infimum is strict in t.

We assume first that $x \mapsto \inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}(u(x,t) - \varphi(t) + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2)$ is equal to $u(0,\bar{t})$ and is constant w.r.t. x in a neighboorhood of $\bar{x}$. We then prove that $M \leq 0$ and $\varphi'(\bar{t}) \geq f(0,\bar{t})$.

This will imply that $\varphi'(\bar{t}) - \mathcal{M}^-_{a,A}(M) \geq f(0,\bar{t})$.

Indeed one has for all x in a neighborhhod of 0, $u(0,\bar{t}) = \inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1}(u(x,t) - \varphi(t) + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2)$ and also by hypothesis

$$u(0,\bar{t}) = \inf_{(|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1), x \in B(0,\delta_1)} \{u(x,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}(Mx,x) + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}$$

and then for all x in a neighborhhod of 0,

$$u(0,\bar{t}) \leq \inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1} \{u(x,t) - \varphi(t) + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\} - \frac{1}{2}(Mx,x) = u(0,\bar{t}) - \frac{1}{2}(Mx,x)$$

This implies that for all x in a neighborhhod of 0,

$$(Mx,x) \leq 0,$$

or equivalently that M is a nonpositive symmetric matrix. Using the definition, as we pointed out before, $\varphi'(\bar{t}) \geq f(0,\bar{t})$ and this implies the desired result.

We now assume that we are not in the case where $x \mapsto \inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1)}(u(x,t) - \varphi(t) + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2)$ is equal to $u(0,\bar{t})$ and is constant w.r.t. x in a neighboorhood of $\bar{x}$.

For the sequel one can assume that M is invertible. indeed, if it is not the case there exists $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small in order that $M - \epsilon Id$ is invertible. Moreover $M - \epsilon Id$ is also such that

$$\inf_{(|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1), x \in B(0,\delta_1)} \{u(x,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}((M - \epsilon Id)(x), x) + C_1|x|^k + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\} = u(0,\bar{t})$$

So we shall prove that

$$\varphi'(\bar{t}) - \mathcal{M}^-_{a,A}(M - \epsilon Id) \leq f(0,\bar{t})$$

and we shall get the result by passing to the limit with ϵ.

So from now we assume that M is invertible.

For $k > 2$ and for all positive constant C_1 then

$$\inf_{(|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1), x \in B(0,\delta_1)} \{u(x,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}(Mx,x) + C_1|x|^k + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}$$

has also its infimum achieved on $(0, \bar{t})$, and this infimum is strict in x and t. Hence for all $\delta > 0$ there exists $\epsilon(\delta) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf \Bigg(& \inf_{(|t-\bar{t}|>\delta, x \in B(0,\delta_1)} \{u(x,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}(Mx,x) + C_1|x|^k + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\} \\ & \inf_{(|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1, |x|>\delta} \{u(x,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}(Mx,x) + C_1|x|^k + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}\Bigg) \\ > \ & u(0,\bar{t}) + \epsilon(\delta) \end{aligned}$$

In the following we choose δ such that $(2\delta)^{k-1} < \frac{\inf_{\lambda_i \in Sp(M)} |\lambda_i(M)|}{2kC_1}$. Let then δ_2 be such that $\delta_2 < \delta$ and

$$k(2\delta_1)^{k-1} C_1 \delta_2 + |M|_\infty(\delta_2^2 + 2\delta_2\delta_1) \leq \epsilon/4$$

With this choice, using the fundamental calculus theorem, one gets that for $x \in B(0, \delta_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta), y \in B(0,\delta)\}} \{u(y,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}(M(y-x),(y-x)) + C_1|x-y|^k + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\} \\ \leq \ & \inf_{(|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1), y \in B(0,\delta_1)} \{u(y,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}(My,y) + C_1|y|^k + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} \\ = \ & u(0,\bar{t}) + \frac{\epsilon}{4} \end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} \inf \Bigg(& \inf_{\{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1), |y|>\delta\}} (\{u(y,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}(M(y-x),(y-x)) + C_1|x-y|^k + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}, \\ & \inf_{(|t-\bar{t}|>\delta, y \in B(0,\delta_1)} \{u(y,t) - \varphi(t) - \frac{1}{2}(M(y-x),(y-x)) \\ + \ & C_1|x-y|^k + C_2(t-\bar{t})^2\}\big) \\ \geq \ & u(0,\bar{t}) + \frac{3\epsilon}{4} \end{aligned} \tag{7.13}$$

We choose x_δ as follows : Since the function $\inf_{|t-\bar{t}|<\delta_1)}(u(x,t) - \varphi(t) + C_2|t-\bar{t}|^2)$ is not constant around $\bar{x}$, for all $\delta > 0$ there exists x_δ and y_δ in $B(0, \delta_2)$

such that

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{|t-\bar t|<\delta_1}\{u(x_\delta,t)-\varphi(t) &+ C_2|t-\bar t|^2\}\\ &> \inf_{|t-\bar t|<\delta_1}\{u(y_\delta,t)-\varphi(t)+C_2|t-\bar t|^2-\left(\frac{1}{2}(M(x_\delta-y_\delta),x_\delta-y_\delta)\right)\\ &+ C_1|x_\delta-y_\delta|^k\}\end{aligned}$$

Then the infimum $\inf_{(|t-\bar t|<\delta_1),y\in B(0,\delta_1)}(u(y,t)-\varphi(t)-\frac{1}{2}(M(y-x_\delta),(y-x_\delta))+C_1|x_\delta-y|^k+C_2(t-\bar t)^2)$, is achieved on some point (z_δ,t_δ) with $z_\delta\neq x_\delta$. Moreover by (7.12) and (7.13) the infimum is achieved in $B(0,\delta)\times]\bar t-\delta,\bar t+\delta[$. Let (z_δ,t_δ) be a point on which this infimum is achieved, then

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x,t) &= \varphi(t)+\frac{1}{2}(M(x-x_\delta),x-x_\delta))-\frac{1}{2}(M(z_\delta-x_\delta),(z_\delta-x_\delta))\\ &+ C_1|x_\delta-z_\delta|^k-C_1|x_\delta-x|^k\\ &- C_2(t-\bar t)^2+C_2(t_\delta-\bar t)^2\end{aligned}$$

achieves u by below on (z_δ,t_δ).

With the choice of δ, the gradient of ψ on z_δ, which equals $M(z_\delta-x_\delta)+kC_1|x_\delta-z_\delta|^{k-2}(x_\delta-z_\delta)$ is different from zero, since $z_\delta\neq x_\delta$. Indeed if it was the case, $x_\delta-z_\delta$ would be an eigenvector for M corresponding to the eigenvalue $kC_1|x_\delta-z_\delta|^{k-1}$, which is impossible since $kC_1(2\delta)^{k-1}<\inf_i(|\lambda_i(M)|$. Using the fact that u is a supersolution one gets that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi'(t_\delta) &- F(M(z_\delta-x_\delta)+kC_1|x_\delta-z_\delta|^{k-2}(x_\delta-z_\delta),M-C_1D^2(|x_\delta-z|^k)(z_\delta))\\ &- h(z_\delta,t_\delta)\cdot\nabla\psi(z_\delta,t_\delta)|\nabla\psi(z_\delta,t_\delta)^\alpha\\ &\geq f(z_\delta,t_\delta)\end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi'(t_\delta) &- \mathcal{M}^-_{a,A}(M-C_1D^2(|x_\delta-z|^k)(z_\delta)\\ &- h(z_\delta,t_\delta)\cdot\nabla\psi(z_\delta,t_\delta)|\nabla\psi(z_\delta,t_\delta)|^\alpha\\ &\geq f(z_\delta,t_\delta)\end{aligned}$$

Letting δ go to zero and using $z_\delta\in B(0,\delta_2)\subset B(0,\delta)$, $|t-t_\delta|<\delta$, $k>2$ and the lower semicontinuity of f one gets

$$\varphi'(\bar t)-\mathcal{M}^-_{a,A}(M)\geq f(0,\bar t)$$

Acknowledgment : The author is very grateful to Isabeau Birindelli for the interest she brought to this subject and the precious advices she gave, which permit to improve it.

References

[1] H. Berestycki, L. Nirenberg, S.R.S. Varadhan, The principal eigenvalue and maximum principle for second-order elliptic operators in general domains, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 47 (1994), pp. 47–92.

[2] I. Birindelli, F. Demengel, Comparison principle and Liouville type results for singular fully nonlinear operators, Ann. Fac. Sci Toulouse Math, 13 (2004), pp. 261-287.

[3] I. Birindelli, F. Demengel, Eigenvalue and Maximum principle for fully nonlinear singular operators Advances in Partial Diff. Equations.11, (2006), pp. 91-119.

[4] I. Birindelli, F. Demengel, Eigenvalue, maximum principle and regularity for fully non linear homogeneous operators, Comm. Pure and Applied Analysis, 6 (2007),pp. 335-366.

[5] I. Birindelli, F. Demengel, The Dirichlet problem for singular fully nonlinear operators, Discrete and Cont. Dynamical Sys., (2007), Special vol. pp. 110-121

[6] I. Birindelli, F. Demengel, Eigenvalue and Dirichlet problem for fully-nonlinear operators in non smooth domains. submitted .

[7] M. Crandall, H. Ishii, P.L. Lions *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations* Bulletin of the mathematical society, Vol. 27, Number 1, July 1992, pages 1-67

[8] M. Crandall, Kocan, P.L. Lions, Swiech *Existence's resultas for boundary problems for uniformly elliptic and parabolic fully non linear equation* ejde, Vol 1999, N24, p. 1-20

[9] L.C. Evans, J. Spruck *Motion of level sets by mean curvature*, I. J. Differential Geom33, (1991), n3, 635-681.

[10] L.C. Evans, J. Spruck *Motion of level sets by mean curvature*, I.I Trans. Amer. Math. soc. 330, (1992) n1, 321-332.

[11] L.C. Evans, J. Spruck *Motion of level sets by mean curvature*, III, J. Geom. Anal, 2, (1992), n2, 121-150.

[12] L.C. Evans, J. Spruck *Motion of level sets by mean curvature*, IV, I. J. Geom. Anal, 5, (1995), n1, 77-114.

[13] H. Ishii, *Viscosity solutions of non-linear partial differential equations* Sugaku Expositions vol 9 , (1996).

[14] H. Ishii, P.L. Lions, *Viscosity solutions of Fully- Nonlinear Second Order Elliptic Partial Differential Equations* J. Differential Equations 83 (1990), no. 1, 26–78.

[15] H. Ishii, P.E. Souganidis *Generalized motion of non compact hyperbolic surfaces with velocity haing arbitrary growth on the curvature tensor* Tohoku Math.Journal, J. 47, (1995), 227-250.

[16] P. Juutinen, *On the principal eigenvalue of a very badly degenerate equation,* J. Differential Equations, 2007, 532-550.

[17] P. Juutinen, B. Kawhol *On the evolution governed by the infinity Laplacian* Math.Ann. 335 (2006)n4, 819-851.

[18] M. Ohnuma, K. Sato *Singular degenerate Parabolic equations with applications to the p-Laplace diffusion equation* Commun. In partial differential equations 22, (3 and 4), 341-411, (1977).